volume xii
winter 1960
number 1

comparative literature

published by the

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation
of the Comparative Literature Section
of the Modern Language
Association of America

Addison's Ballad Papers and the Reaction to Metaphysical Wit. By Albert B. Friedman. 1

The Pilgrim Journeys of Bunyan and Heinrich Jung-Stilling. By Lawrence Marsden Price. 14

Equicola and the School of Lyons. By Santina C. Vial. 19

Inglis' *Rambles*: A Romantic Tribute to *Don Quixote*. By W. U. McDonald, Jr. 33

A Note on Ariosto's *I Suppositi*. By Karl F. Thompson. 42

The Novels of Samuel Beckett: An Amalgam of Joyce and Proust. By Melvin J. Friedman. 47

Book Reviews. 59

Le Théâtre Libre d'Antoine, by Francis Pruner (S. M. Waxman). *American Literature as Viewed in Germany, 1818-1861*, by H. W. Hewett-Thayer (Christof Wegelin). *Shakespeare's Stage*, by A. M. Nagler (Richard Hosley). *Forschungsprobleme der vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*, II. Folge, ed. by Fritz Ernst and Kurt Wais (Ransom Taylor). *Les Flandres dans les mouvements romantique et symboliste* (Ransom Taylor). *The Art of Beowulf*, by A. G. Brodeur (S. B. Greenfield). *Van Pascha tot Noah*, by W. A. P. Smit (S. L. Flaxman). *Dante Studies 2*, by C. S. Singleton (Edward Williamson) *Romain Rolland*, by Teresa Di Scanno (W. T. Starr). *The Broken Compass: A Study of the Major Comedies of Ben Jonson*, by E. B. Partridge (R. L. Clubb). *Mallarmé in Italy*, by Olga Ragusa (C. B. B.).

Varia. 93

A Note on Beckett, Dante, and Geulincx, by Ruby Cohn. Locus Amoenus by H. M. Currie. Announcements. Books Received.

comparative literature

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. *Comparative Literature* particularly welcomes longer studies on comprehensive topics and on problems of literary criticism.

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Assistant Editor

PERRY J. POWERS
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

VICTOR LANGE
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

MARK SCHORER
University of California
Berkeley, Calif.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the post office at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.
The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00.
Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

volume xii
winter 1960
number 1

ALBERT B. FRIEDMAN

Addison's Ballad Papers And the Reaction to Metaphysical Wit

IN THREE NUMBERS of the *Spectator*, Addison laid the foundations of English ballad criticism. Papers Nos. 70 and 74 demonstrated the "extreme natural and poetical" sentiment, the "majestic simplicity," of the old song of "Chevy Chase" to all readers that were not "unqualified for such entertainment by their affectation or their ignorance." Two weeks later (No. 85) Addison recommended in more restrained language "The Two Children in the Wood," "one of the darling songs of the common people," to the same special audience—the restraint was induced by the facetious squibs that had appeared in the interval, ridiculing his championing of such vulgar stuff. These three papers, coming in 1711 and from Addison, have been regarded as something of an anomaly.

Unlike his volatile collaborator Steele, long a "Romantic before Romanticism,"[1] Addison is invariably placed well on the neoclassic side of the critical spectrum, indeed a "classic of the classics."[2] The date of the papers, the year of the *Essay on Criticism* and a half century before Percy's *Reliques*, lies distressingly deep in neoclassic territory, and it is an axiom of literary history that a serious interest in popular poetry was not consonant with the dominant standards of the early eighteenth century. Yet, when these papers are carefully examined and placed in their correct context, it appears that Addison was not torturing strange

[1] Macaulay, *Literary Essays* (Oxford, 1923), p. 652; Paul Hamelius, *Die Kritik in der englischen Literatur der 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 103.

[2] Harko de Maar, *A History of English Romanticism* (London, 1924), p. 6.

meanings from current critical precepts in order to justify an eccentric private enthusiasm for old ballads, but rather that he had been taught to see that an appreciation of the ballads was consistent with, indeed enforced by, a thoroughgoing application of neoclassic doctrine. His teachers were Montaigne, Malherbe, and Boileau, from whom he borrowed not only his line of reasoning but also his illustrations and anecdotes. Moreover, I think it can be shown, Addison's ballad essays are the English counterpart of a general European practice of using the appeal and style of popular poetry as a weapon against the various national versions of metaphysical wit.

There is a hint of Addison's purpose in the fact that he singled out "Chevy Chase" and "The Two Children in the Wood" for praise and analysis. "Chevy Chase" was distinguished by an obvious antiquity, since it commemorated an actual mediaeval border fray, and its "bold strokes of nature" and heroic atmosphere encouraged comparison with the ancient epics. Above all, had not Sidney testified to the martial stimulus exerted by "the olde song of *Percy* and *Duglas*"? But what may have counted most with Addison was the fact that the ballad was known and sung on all social levels, as the lightness of the allusions to 'Squire Widdrington's exploit in *Hudibras* and in the contemporary drama suggests. According to a verse in one of the *Pills to Purge Melancholy*, "To sing Chevy Chase o'er a Pot of good Ale" made a gay evening for carters and mechanics.[3] But it would seem that even grave philosophers relished such entertainment; for Locke, listening to a choir on the continent, commented acidly: "He that could not though he had a cold make better music with a chevy-chace over a pot of smooth ale, deserved well to pay the reckoning and go away athirst."[4] "Chevy Chase" apparently had become almost the generic term for an old ballad.

Quite possibly, Addison had no special fondness for this ballad, but fixed upon it as the best representative specimen. And he may have chosen "The Two Children in the Wood" for much the same reason. Gay's rural clown Bowzybeus sang the ballad first in his repertoire,[5] and, tacked on the wall, it was one of the first sights that met the hermits' eyes when they stepped into the hospitable cottage of Swift's Baucis and Philemon.[6] Chateaubriand came back from his English exile with the impression that "Les Enfants dans le Bois" was the favorite ballad

[3] III (1719), 19.

[4] Locke to Strachey, Dec. 24, 1665, in H. F. Bourne, *John Locke* (New York, 1876), I, 113.

[5] *Shepherd's Week* (1714), in *Works* (Oxford, 1926), p. 53.

[6] *Poems*, ed. Harold Williams (Oxford, 1937), I, 114.

theme of the English people.[7] This was a shrewd observation; Sir Charles Firth believes this pathetic piece was "the most famous of all ballads."[8]

Diverted by Addison's strenuous paralleling of passages from "Chevy Chase" with passages from Virgil and by his detailed appreciation of the pathos achieved in "The Two Children in the Wood," we are apt to overlook just how important the popularity of the two ballads is for his argument. Addison's main point is that the ballads illustrate that a poem can succeed, indeed best succeeds, by virtue of simplicity of thought and style. Needlessly complicated thought and excessive or overly ingenious ornamentation please only the literary dandies. Addison's unconventional use of the ballads for his illustrations commits him to a second proposition—any work which, like the two ballads, has pleased many generations of readers and readers of all strata of society, from Sir Philip Sidney to the humblest tinker, must have great, if recondite, merit. The wisdom of choosing two ballads of universal and long-standing popularity now becomes apparent. Moreover, the approval of the people, far from inviting suspicion, should be considered the mark of particular grace, since the people are least tolerant of affectation and least susceptible of all classes to the prejudicial influence of fashion, reputation, or prescriptions of criticism. In the odd moments when it actually is the voice of God, the populace demands simplicity.

"Of Simplicity in Poetical Composition," John Dennis' attack on the first two ballad papers—he did not wait for the third—shows by the title alone that he recognized what almost all subsequent critics have chosen to ignore; it is Addison's doctrine of simplicity, not his affection for "Chevy Chase," which is at the heart of the matter.[9] Naturally Dennis loses no opportunity to disparage the ballad, but that is incidental. Nor does he have any quarrel with the ideal of simplicity itself. The Spectator's prescription for achieving it, however, sets him snarling through several pages. The Spectator mistook bareness and vulgarity for simplicity, hence his approval of the ballad. True simplicity reduces ornament to design, manages strangeness and richness without confusion, and attains thereby, as Rapin showed, grandeur and majesty. Dennis is quite in sympathy with the Spectator's attack on persons with Gothic tastes, but he is careful to indicate that he thinks that the ballads, too, are Gothic.

[7] "Essai sur la littérature anglaise," *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1867), VI, 54. The French translation of the *Spectateur; ou le Socrate Moderne* (1718) omits Nos. 70 and 74, but includes No. 85 (VII, 241 ff.).

[8] *Shakespeare's England*, ed. Sir Sidney Lee (Oxford, 1926), II, 530.

[9] *Critical Works*, ed. E. N. Hooker (Baltimore, 1939-43), II, 29-40.

Even more irritating to Dennis was Addison's notion (No. 70), based on the heterodox Cartesian premise that human nature is the same in all "reasonable creatures," that

> it is impossible that anything should be universally tasted and approved by a multitude, though they are only the rabble of a nation, which hath not in it some peculiar aptness to gratify the mind of man.

Strange as it may seem, Addison's reasoning toward a "democratic" theory of taste was here mainly influenced by the controversy between the Ancients and the Moderns. Longinus had written:

> When men of different pursuits, lives, ambitions, ages, languages, hold identical views on one and the same subject, then that verdict which results, so to speak, from a consent of discordant elements makes our faith in the object of admiration strong and unassailable.[10]

In his *Reflections on Longinus*, which are sometimes more accurately reflections on Perrault, Boileau caught up this remark to use against the champions of the Moderns:

> When Writers have been Admir'd a great many Ages ... there's not only Madness but Rashness in doubting the merits of such writers ... [for] the Bulk of Mankind will not always be mistaken in their judgment.[11]

Boileau in his general preface, moreover, had said that anything that did not hit the taste of the public, immediately or eventually, was a "paultry performance." So Johnson was later to affirm that

> by the common sense of readers, uncorrupted by literary prejudices, after all the refinements of subtlety and the dogmatism of learning, must be finally decided all claim to poetical honors.[12]

Both the dictators meant, to import Goethe's distinction, the *Publikum* not the *Pöbel*, and both, doubtless, would have thought Addison extreme, or perhaps clumsy, in narrowing *consensus gentium* to *consensus populi*; but Addison is clearly drawing on the same premises.

That these passages from Longinus and Boileau were in Addison's mind when he was writing the ballad papers can hardly be questioned. The "Englishing" of Boileau's works was going forward at just this time under Addison's auspices.[13] Addison may not have required the *Peri Hypsous* "Translated from Boileau's translation," and he does not, unlike Swift's canting critic, "Quote quotation on quotation,"[14] but he profited from the French critic's *Reflections* nonetheless. It was, for

[10] *On the Sublime*, ed. W. R. Roberts (Cambridge, 1907), p. 57.
[11] *Works*, trans. John Ozell et al. (1711-12), II, 114.
[12] *Lives of the Poets*, ed. Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1905), III, 441.
[13] The "life" by Des Maizeaux prefixed to Ozell's translation is printed as a letter to Addison. See *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford, 1941), pp. 94, 249.
[14] Swift, "On Poetry" (1733), in *Poems*, ed. Williams, III, 649.

example, from an oblique attack on the Moderns in the *Reflections* that he picked up the important anecdote—used in the first "Chevy Chase" essay—about Molière reading his comedies to his housekeeper and foretelling "the success of his play by the reception it met at his fireplace."[15]

Another channel of French influence on the ballad papers becomes apparent when one realizes that these essays are not independent, but are in fact the pendant of the series of essays on true and false wit (*Spectator*, Nos. 58-63). If this relationship had not been so consistently overlooked, one would say it was obvious.[16] All three ballad papers are permeated with an animus against the "Gothic manner of writing," against those who have "formed to themselves a wrong and artificial taste upon little fanciful writers and authors of epigrams." These are the readers who (No. 70) are "unqualified for the entertainment" afforded by an ordinary song or ballad. We turn over a few leaves and read in No. 74:

> Had this old song been filled with epigrammatical turns and points of wit, it might perhaps have pleased the wrong taste of some readers...

For emphasis, Addison repeats:

> If this song had been written in the Gothic manner, which is the delight of all our little wits, whether writers or readers, it would not have hit the taste of so many ages, and have pleased the readers of all ranks and conditions.

And in the last paragraph of No. 85: "As for the little conceited wits of the day... they cannot be supposed to admire these productions."

In the key paper of the wit series (No. 62), we had heard of the "Gothic manner of writing" and had been struck by the melancholy judgment that "the taste of most of our English poets, as well as readers, is extremely Gothic." The "little conceited wits" in No. 85 are Segrais' *petits esprits*, whose character Addison had drawn in No. 62. Nothing so strikingly points up the indifference of ballad scholars to the crucial context of these papers as to read in Gerould's standard work on the traditional ballad of Addison's "enthusiastic and somewhat laboured defense of the 'Gothic manner'"![17]

Surprisingly enough, Addison's guide in negotiating a transition between true and false wit and popular poetry was Montaigne. The Spectator's classification of false wit takes as the first species

---

[15] For Boileau, see *Works*, II, 89; cf. *Spectator* No. 70.

[16] C. S. Lewis links the wit and ballad papers—see "Addison" in *Essays... Presented to David Nichol Smith* (Oxford, 1945), pp. 8-9—but persists in the standard and erroneous belief that the ballad papers represent the romantic lapse of a neoclassic critic, a tribute to Addison's "openmindedness."

[17] G. H. Gerould, *The Ballad of Tradition* (Oxford, 1932), p. 250.

those short poems printed among the minor Greek poets, which resemble the figure of an egg, a pair of wings, an ax, a shepherd's pipe, and an altar.[18]

In the opening paragraph of the essay "Of Vaine Subtilties," Montaigne writes (in Florio's language):

There are certaine frivolous and vaine inventions... by means of which, some men doe often endevour to get credit and reputation, as divers Poets, that frame whole volumes with verses beginning with one letter: we see Egges, Wings, Hatchets, Crosses, Globes, Columnes, and divers other such like figures anciently fashioned by the Graecians...[19]

He then cites from Plutarch and Quintilian samples of misapplied ingenuity very much of a type with Addison's modern instances. Where Addison lists the literary follies whose allegorizations we are to meet later when he somnambulates through the Garden of False Wit,[20] Montaigne, after one of his maddening transitions, passes on to a short catalogue of "choses que se tiennent par les deux bouts extremes," concluding with the remark that the simple peasant and the philosopher are more alike than either is to the "mongrell sort... of which... I am one." As a by-the-by illustration of this modest point there is a passage on the "Villanelles, homely gigs, and countrie songs of Gasconie," for

popular and meerely natural Poesie hath certaine graces, and in-bred livelinesse, whereby it concurreth and compareth it selfe unto the principall beautie of perfect and artificiall Poesie.[21]

Explicit directions for relating the wit and ballad papers are given by Addison himself three hundred *Spectators* later:

I have endeavoured in several of my speculations to banish this Gothic taste [for epigrams, points of wit, forced conceits], which has taken possession among us. I entertained the town, for a week altogether, with an essay upon wit, in which I endeavoured to detect several of those false kinds which have been admired in the different ages of the world; and at the same time to shew wherein the nature of true wit consists. I afterwards gave an instance of the great force which lies in a natural simplicity of thought to affect the mind of the reader, from such vulgar pieces as have little else besides this single qualification to recommend them.[22]

The "vulgar pieces" are, of course, "Chevy Chase" and "The Two Children in the Wood," the appreciation of which Addison uses as a

[18] *Spectator*, No. 58.

[19] *Essays*, ed. Thomas Seccombe (London, 1908), I, 427. There is a similar passage in Hobbes' answer to Davenant (J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford, 1908, II, 57) but with no mention of the Greeks. Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, 4th ed. (Edinburgh, 1922), II, 541, weakly proffers Muratori, *La perfetta poesia*, as the source.

[20] *Spectator*, No. 63.

[21] *Essays*, I, 431.

[22] No. 409.

drastic test of assured good taste, as a wedge to root out a false style of expression.

Precisely what the false style of expression was and the grounds for the neoclassic rejection of it emerges from Addison's quest for a standard of wit. Wit-stylistic, wit as ingenuity—the "discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike"[23]—had been, of course, the leading characteristic of metaphysical verse. Whenever in later times the metaphysicals were pulled down from the undusted top shelves to which they were so long relegated, it was necessary to recall their conception of wit to understand them. Thus Johnson made an exposition of wit the center of his technical criticism in the *Life of Cowley*; a hundred years later, Courthope found it expedient to arrange seventeenth-century poetry according to species of wit; and the modern poetry of paradox, the creative counterpart of the criticism which has stimulated the current vogue of the metaphysicals, has revived the special meaning of the word along with the technique. For neoclassicism, wit remained an ideal, but the meaning was altering even though the symbol stood fast. Hobbes had included in wit both fancy and judgment, both the inventive, imaginative faculty and the faculty of discrimination;[24] but by Locke's day this comprehensive meaning of wit had grown rarer, and judgment was separated from wit and set up as wit's monitor.[25] Obviously the imprisonment of wit (fancy, excess, extravagance) in the mechanical wit-judgment formula was due originally to the quiet pressures of the rationalistic atmosphere; but the immediate, impelling reason doubtless was the anarchic exuberance of ingenious metaphysical wit, which drew suspicion on the imaginative faculty in general. The metaphysical style was now unsuitably odd, fantastic, frivolous; it was witty, but wit of this sort, it was coming to be felt, was not a legitimate poetic means. After the Restoration a great deal began to be heard of "true wit," and of "that which is not, yet is accompted wit," of "false wit."

For Addison, true wit is not, as it is with Dryden or Dennis, simply a happy balance of wit and judgment. Citing Locke's definition of wit ("the assemblage of ideas, and putting those together, wherein can be found any resemblance or congruity"),[26] he refines upon the philosopher's conception by discerning three types of wit. The highest of them, true wit, is the pure product of the wit faculty, a "resemblance of ideas,"

[23] *Rambler*, No. 194.

[24] *English Works*, ed. Sir William Molesworth, IV (1840), 50 f. See also, W. Lee Ustick and H. H. Hudson, "Wit, 'Mixt Wit,' and the Bee in Amber," *HLB*, VIII (1935), 108.

[25] *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, II, xi, 2.

[26] *Spectator*, No. 62.

not of words. "The mere resemblance of words" accounts for false wit, a category into which Addison deposits the punning and end-rime poets, lipogrammatists, acrostic makers, and other fashioners of typographical nonsense, with whom he has just had four numbers' worth of sport. A resemblance partly of words, partly of ideas, is mixed wit, the wit of the epigrammatists and the highly conceited witty poets.

> This kind of wit is that which abounds in Cowley, more than in any other author that ever wrote. The Italians are full of it...[27]

Plainly the metaphysicals are the beasts Addison has in view.

This becomes even plainer when he affirms that no thought can be beautiful which is not

> just and has not its foundations in the nature of things... the basis of all wit is truth; and... no thought can be valuable, of which good sense is not the groundwork...[28]

Here he is joining the verse essayists, Mulgrave and Lansdowne, in censuring the metaphysicals by requiring comparisons more natural, more in conformity with general experience.

> *Wit* should be only brought
> To turn agreeably some proper thought,

said Mulgrave.[29]

> Wit and fine writing [Addison echoes] doth not consist in advancing things that are new, as in giving things that are known an agreeable turn.[30]

This Boilevian sentiment we know best from the agreeable turn which Pope gave it. Those, however, who lack the "strength of genius to make a thought shine in its own natural beauty" are forced to hunt after "foreign ornaments" and let no piece of wit escape them.

> One glittering thought no sooner strikes our eyes
> With silent wonder, but new wonders rise,

and "all promote the common blaze"—so the youthful Addison had written of Cowley.[31] Pope, too, was shortly to deal with those who

> to conceit alone their taste confine
> And glittering thoughts struck out in ev'ry line:
> Pleased with a work where nothing's just or fit;
> One glaring chaos and wild heap of wit.[32]

Addison's label for the offending poets is "Gothic" (the modern label

---

[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *An Essay upon Poetry* (1682), in Spingarn, *Critical Essays*, II, 294.
[30] *Spectator*, No. 253.
[31] "An Account of the Great English Poets" (1694), *Works*, ed. Hurd, I, 23.
[32] *Essay on Criticism*, lines 89-92.

would be "baroque")[33] because the chaotic wit of Cleveland and Cowley resembles, to his mind, the busy work, the cusps, crockets, tracery, and "crinkle-crankle" of Gothic architecture.

Since the vogue of the metaphysicals was already spent in 1711, it may seem that Addison is beating on an open door in the wit papers. But this is to misunderstand the operation of practical, reforming criticism. After their departure, the metaphysicals had still to be officially dismissed, if only that the new taste might be installed in terms of this dismissal.[34] "We only can by negatives define" is antiquated logic but effective critical method. In probing the faults and failures and inanities of the "late fantastics," Addison is advocating by indirection the program of neoclassical, regular poetry.[35]

We have in the ballad papers, then, a contrast between the ballad and meretricious metaphysical verse. Carew in his elegy on Donne[36] foretold the day when "Verse refin'd by thee in this last Age, / Turn ballad rime," and that day Addison seems to be inaugurating. The allegorical, enthymematical mode of expression which came to its last exuberant flower in the metaphysicals was not of course restricted to England. In Spain it burgeoned out in *cultismo* and *conceptismo;* Italy had its *secentismo* and *marinismo;* in France these movements were matched by certain tendencies of the Pléiade and by *préciosité*. The recoil from this general style was naturally just as widespread, and one discovers from even a superficial survey of this European reaction that Addison was not alone in citing the simplicity of popular poetry against the obscurity and excessive refinement of the various "last Ages."

The *anti-culteranos* in Spain, for example, furnish an excellent parallel, even though the ballad had been an important force in Spanish poetry from the later sixteenth century. And, paradoxically, the chief poet of the tradition analogous to the metaphysical, Góngora, had himself been a successful composer of *romances de tipo popular*. Indeed three of these poems were later accepted by Herder as authentic utterances of the *Stimme des Volkes*.[37] But the chasm between the Góngora

[33] See René Wellek, *The Rise of English Literary History* (Chapel Hill, 1941), p. 66.

[34] The altering conception of "wit" in the later seventeenth century, for example, *reflects*, did not *cause*, the change in taste which bore the metaphysicals down. The contrary opinion is set out in the summary paragraph of A. H. Nethercot, "The Reputation of the 'Metaphysical Poets' During the Seventeenth Century," *JEGP*, XXIII (1924), 197.

[35] Courthope demonstrates that Pope, too, is pointing his remarks on wit against the decadent metaphysicals—see *Works of Pope*, ed. W. Elwin and W. J. Courthope, V (1889), 48 ff.

[36] John Donne, *Poems*, ed. H. J. C. Grierson (Oxford, 1933), p. 348.

[37] *Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan, XXV, 537.

of the *letrillas* and *romances amorosos* and the poet of the *Soledades*, "delicias de los entendimientos no vulgares," was vast, a contrast of which the advocates of a simpler, regular style availed themselves in their attacks. Not surprisingly, it was Lope de Vega, in whose voluminous works one finds an amazingly varied use of popular material,[38] who was most keenly aware of the stabilizing value of the popular subcurrent of Spanish poetry. To those refined poets who scorned the traditional *romance* meters as crude, as the lower primer (*cartilla*) of poetry, Lope replied, following the lines laid down by Juan de la Cueva, with the forthright defense of their ability "no solo de exprimir y declarar cualquier conceto con fácil dulzura, pero de proseguir toda grave acción."[39] The determination of the Gongorists to seek out, in Quevedo's phrase, "las nuevas frases como al vulgo ocultas" and to mold them in the foreign manner Lope considers vicious, indeed traitorous. He makes much of this point in the *Justa poética* (1620), the sharpest contribution in his quarrel with Góngora, where the venerable popularesque items in the *Cancionero general* are cited perhaps a dozen times.[40] *La Gatomaquia*, with its strong flavor of the *romances moriscos* that Góngora so heartily detested, is prefaced with a *Soneto* beginning,

> Con dulze voz, y pluma diligente,
> y no vestida de confusos chaos,
> cantais Tome las vodas, los saraos,
> de Zapaquilda y Mizifuf, valiente.[41]

Tirso de Molina echoes his master in a passage of the *Deleytar aprovechando* describing a festival of mountain folk. The Olallas, Blases, and Giles go off to a dance where

> trouas cantan, no cultas por estrañas,
> que alla no se autorizan
> los que al uso de agora gongorizan.[42]

In Italy the campaign against *secentismo* was conducted with polite pastoral rites by various literary sodalities calling themselves Arcadias. Along with their earnest manifestoes, the Arcadians adopted the method, resembling Addison's in principle, of the antidote, the corrective

[38] See Menéndez Pidal, *La primitiva poesía lírica española* (Madrid, 1919), p. 82, and J. A. Moore, *The Romancero in Lope de Vega* (Philadelphia, 1940).

[39] *Rimas* (Madrid, 1609; facsimile ed., New York, 1903), fols. P4v-P5.

[40] *Prosa varia* (Madrid, 1938), II, 121 ff. Earlier, Castillejo had used popular poetry for purposes of contrast; see "Contra los que dejan los metros castellaños . . . ," lines 18 ff. in Milton Buchanan, *Spanish Poetry of the Golden Age* (Toronto, 1942), p. 43.

[41] *Rimas humanas y divinas* (1634; facsimile ed., San Sebastian, 1935), fol. 86 v.

[42] Quoted in M. Romera-Navarro, *La preceptiva dramática de Lope de Vega* (Madrid, 1935), p. 275 n.

model. The Arcadia of the 1690s, whose pastor was Crescimbeni, revived interest in the troubadours as well as the erudite Petrarchan style of Angelo di Costanza. The Bolognese, influenced no doubt by the interest of contemporary aesthetics in rhapsodic Greek and Hebrew poetry, set their shepherds to writing Chiabreran Pindarics. Perhaps the only valid productions stimulated by the Arcadias were the short lyrics of Felice Zappi, Frugoni, and Rolli, which sprang from the revival of a *canzonetta* tradition reaching back to Politian and the popular lyrics of the Trecento.[43] Possibly the critical justification of primitive and popular poetry which was being worked out in Italy from Castelvetro through Vico to Cesarotti had some bearing on this brief neoclassic flirtation with the Italian popular muse.[44]

The analogues in French literature are most impressive. Montaigne has already been discussed. The Pléiade turned their backs on the *chansons populaires*, lumping them with the *rondeaux, ballades, virelais,* and *chants royaux* as "belles épiceries qui corrompent le goust de nostre langue."[45] The *chansons* were associated with the thin, tinny mediaeval meters; they were permeated with provincial folklore, which the Pléiade would not endure; and, what most disqualified them, the *chansons* were for the vulgar and untaught. Nothing pleased Ronsard

> hors ce qui peut déplaire
> Au jugement du rude populaire . . .[46]

This, however, from a poet who studied the "uncanny musical rightness" of the popular songs attentively.[47]

Enfin Malherbe vint. He countered the older poets first, and basically, on their promiscuous linguistic ideas, his annotated Desportes being a relic of this phase of his rule. Though *plébéien* was not the least frequent of Malherbe's ill-natured scholia,[48] Racan reports that, whenever Malherbe was questioned on a point of usage, "il envoyait ordinairement aux crocheteurs du Port-au-Foin, et disoit que c'estoient ses maistres pour le langage."[49] This advice was gracefully satirized by Régnier in

[43] Giulio Natali, *Il Settecento* (Milan, 1936), II, 656 ff.

[44] The most striking Italian analogue to the ballad papers is the speech of Apollo to the blind ballad singer in Trajano Boccalini, *Advertisements from Parnassus*, trans. anon. (London, 1704), II, 244-245.

[45] Du Bellay, *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse*, ed. H. Chamard (Paris, 1948), pp. 181 ff.

[46] See F. Brunetière, *Histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1927), I, 268-269.

[47] See M. Françon, "Ronsard et la poésie populaire," *MLN*, LXV (1950), 55 ff.

[48] F. Brunot, *Malherbe* (Paris, 1891), pp. 224, 242.

[49] *Œuvres complètes*, ed. T. de Latour (Paris, 1857), I, 274.

a well-known set of lines.[50] As a further example of his "indelicate" taste, Malherbe's biographers instance that "il aymoit autant ouyr chanter une chanson de Pont Neuf [i. e., street ballad] que le plus bel air du monde."[51] Again, an incident for which both Racan and Tallement des Réaux vouch, one day Chapelain found Malherbe on his couch singing:

> D'où venez vous, Jeanne?
> Jeanne, d'où venez...

et ne se leva point qu'il n'eust achevé: "J'aimerois mieux" lui dit-il, "avoir fait cela que toutes les œuvres de Ronsard."[52]

To force the parallel, we might remind ourselves that Addison drew from nowhere the information that "Ben Jonson used to say, he had rather have been the author of ['Chevy Chase'] than all his works."[53]

French criticism has not overlooked Malherbe's remark. There is in him, Fournel writes, something of Alceste:

> Comme Alceste... il fait profession de préférer à tous les raffinements des poëtes de son temps les vieilles chansons populaires, ce qui semblerait indiquer, à moins qu'il ne fût simplement guidé par l'amour de la contradiction, un esprit capable... de sentir le naturel et la naïveté.[54]

Alceste of course is *le misanthrope* and the allusion is to the *scène du sonnet*.[55] There Oronte breaks in upon Philinte and Alceste to read a sonnet which is a sorry pastiche of precious amorous trivia. Like the amateur critics in Lope's *La Dorotea*, Alceste begins to dissect the poem line by line:

> Vous vous estes réglé sur de méchants modèles,
> Et vos expressions ne sont point naturelles.

He questions several phrases and the *chute*, complains of the "méchant goût du siècle," and cites by way of comparison an old folk song:

> La rime n'est pas riche, et le stile en est vieux:
> Mais ne voyez-vous pas que cela vaut bien mieux
> Que ces colifichets dont le bon sens murmure...[56]

Alceste repeats the song, and to the laughing Philinte insists,

---

[50] *Satires*, IX, 20 ff.

[51] Tallemant des Réaux, *Historiettes*, ed. Georges Mongrédien (Paris, 1932), I, 197.

[52] *Ibid.*, I. 177-178.

[53] *Spectator*, No. 70. The authority for Addison's remark has never been discovered.

[54] Victor Fournel, *De Malherbe à Bossuet* (Paris, 1885), p. 8.

[55] I, ii.

[56] J.-B. Weckerlin, *Chansons populaires des provinces de France* (Paris, 1860), p. 200, cites traditional survivals of Alceste's folk song.

Ouy, monsieur le rieur, malgré vos beaux esprits,
J'estime plus cela que la pompe fleurie
De tous ces faux brillants où chacun se récrie.

Reminiscences of this famous scene are to be found elsewhere in Molière,[57] in Pascal,[58] and in the second volume of Perrault's *Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes*,[59] where M. le Chevalier, M. l'Abbé, and M. le Président debate the relevance of the misanthrope's sentiments to that great seventeenth-century problem. Even if he had not left a record of it, we might have taken it for certain that Addison had read and was impressed by Alceste's arguments.[60] But the excerpt need not be accepted as one of Addison's sources to serve our purpose; it does well enough simply as a parallel. For Molière is not merely praising the *vieille chanson* nor is he using the scene simply to express through a convenient *porte-parole* an unusual, personal taste for such poetry. His character compares the old song with the refinements of precious thinking and phrasing as an instructive example of the neoclassic ideals of simplicity and naturalness.

And this, essentially, was Addison's purpose in the "Chevy Chase" papers. Because of the loose organization of Addison's general argument and its staggered publication, the illustrations (the ballad papers) won a separate existence from their text (the wit papers), and, as it happens, were more influential for being independent. But this accident should not conceal from us the fact that Addison's ballad criticism was conceived in full support of orthodox neoclassicism.

Harvard University

[57] *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, I, ii.

[58] *Pensées*, ed. L. Brunschvicg (Paris, 1925), I. 43.

[59] Quatrième Dialogue (1693), 194-195.

[60] There is a direct reference to *Le Misanthrope* in *Spectator*, No. 85; and in *Tatler*, No. 163 Addison writes his own *scène du sonnet*, in which Ned (Oronte) is a "true English reader ... wonderfully pleased with the little Gothic ornaments of epigrammatical conceits, turns, points and quibbles ..." In *Guardian*, No. 16 (Mar. 30, 1713), Steele speaks in an Addisonian manner of French songs—"there is no living language that abounds so much in good songs"—and contrasts wit and song: "Of all our countrymen, none are more defective in their songs, through a redundancy of wit, than Dr. Donne and Mr. Cowley."

LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE

The Pilgrim Journeys Of Bunyan and Heinrich Jung-Stilling

IN HIS LIFE history Heinrich Jung-Stilling wrote: "Etwa gegen das Ende des Julius 1792, kam ... der Buchhändler Krieger in Marburg zu Stilling und bat ihn, er möchte ihm doch auch einmal etwas Ästhetisches, etwa einen Roman, in Verlag geben ... Jetzt fiel Stilling plötzlich der Gedanke ein, er habe von Jugend auf den Wunsch in seiner Seele genährt, nach *Johann Bunians* Beispiel,[1] den Buß- Bekehrungs- und Heiligungsweg des wahren Christen unter dem Bilde einer Reise zu beschreiben" (I, 610).[2]

Stilling called his book *Das Heimweh*. Its motto was: "Selig sind, die das Heimweh haben, denn sie sollen nach Hause kommen." It was written between August 1793 and December 1794. "Es war eine selige Zeit," Stilling tells us, and the book found favor:

> Eine Menge Exemplare wanderten nach Amerika, wo es häufig gelesen wird. In Asien, wo es christlich gesinnte Deutsche gibt, wurde *das Heimweh* bekannt und gelesen. Aus Dänemark, Schweden und Rußland bis nach Astrachan bekam Stilling Zeugnisse dieses Beifalls. Aus allen Provinzen Deutschlands erhielt Stilling aus allen Ständen—vom Thron bis zum Pflug—eine Menge Briefe, die ihm den lautesten Beifall bezeugten ... Mit Einem Wort, es gibt wenig Bücher, die eine solche starke und weit um sich greifende Sensation gemacht haben, als Stillings *Heimweh* [I, 610-612].

The book was planned to narrate "die leidensvolle Reise eines Christen nach seiner himmlichen Heimath." This describes Bunyan's

[1] There is a good account of the translations of Bunyan's works into German: Auguste Sann, *Bunyan in Deutschland* (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, XLVI, 1951).

[2] This and the following references are to *Johann Heinrich Jungs, genannt Stilling Sämtliche Werke* (Stuttgart, 1841).

work more accurately than Jung-Stilling's, and Stilling admits, "daß das ganze Werk eine ganz andere Gestalt, und die Dichtung eine ganz andere Tendenz bekam, als er sich im Anfang gedacht hatte" (I, 610-611). Bunyan's work records *The Pilgrim's Progress from this World to that which is to Come.* Jung-Stilling's work records the triumphs and the sufferings of Eugenius on his predestined journey from his village in Germany to the Oriental land of Solyman, and the founding there of a theocratic Utopia of all true Christians, of which Eugenius becomes the prince.

The Pilgrim's Progress can be read conveniently in an hour or two. *Das Heiweh* is a narrative of nearly 1,200 pages followed by a *Schlüssel* of over two hundred pages. Christian Ostenheim is summoned to go to a cave at midnight to meet "die grauen Felsenmänner." He is dubbed "ein Ritter des heiligen Kreuzes," and in place of his given name, Christian, he receives the "Ordensnamen" Eugenius. He goes forth, rescues a lady in distress, withstands the blandishments of a modern Venusberg, endures imprisonment, starvation, and torture, and barely escapes despair before he wins his appointed triumph.

Yet the two works have certain similarities. In both there are several dialogues, the disputations in *Das Heimweh* being much longer. Both works make use of characterizing names, but in place of the blunt names, Mr. Talkative, Mr. Obstinate, Mr. Pliable, Mr. Worldly Wiseman in *Pilgrim's Progress,* we have a more subtle nomenclature in *Das Heimweh.* Such names as Eugenius and Theophil are characterizing; but, without the aid of "Der Schlüssel zum Heimweh," who would know that in the name of Eugenius' appointed bride, Urania Sophia von Edang, Edang is Gnade spelled backwards! Frau von Traun auf Bileniz conceals the name Frau von Natur auf Leibniz, Fräulein von Nischlin is Fräulein von Sinnlich, Saphienta is Phantasie, i.e., Schwärmerei, Athanasius Weisenau is Athanasius Weineaus, Helferich Saftey is Falsche Freyheit, Richmuth Hochsteigel is Geistlicher Hochmuth, and Trevernau is Vertrauen (V, 326, 369, 375, 383, 384, 420).

There can be no doubt, however, that Jung-Stilling was ever mindful of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress.* He read it at an early age with a full understanding of its allegories. In his eighth year he began to write such a book himself, but his father smiled and said, "ja, Heinrich, das kannst du nicht brauchen, das hat ja Bunian schon gebraucht. Du hast ihm nur ein anderes Mäntelchen umgehangen" (V, 311). This was in 1748. Jung-Stilling finished his work about fifty years later. Inward unrest rather than outward circumstances delayed the completion.

Stilling first became acquainted with unorthodox views at the table of

Salzmann in Strassburg. "Dort wurde ich mit Freigeistern bekannt und erst jetzt," he tells us, "lernte ich alle Einwürfe kennen, die man gegen die christliche Religion macht" (V, 312). Goethe defended him from the ridicule of the flippant students and introduced him to Herder, who treated him with a sympathy and indulgence he did not always extend to Goethe, and Stilling found "[daß] er mit deisem herrlichen Genie, in Ansehung des Naturells, mehr harmonierte als mit Goethe" (I, 350). But the religion of Goethe and Herder was far different from the simple trust of Jung-Stilling's household. Here Stilling's faith came into conflict with reason. "Fragt Ihr mich, meine Lieben! Wie ist es denn möglich gewesen, daß ich in dieser Gemüthsverfassung habe ein Christ bleiben können?" It would have been impossible, he says, had he not had daily evidence, "daß Gott auf eine ganz besondere und handgreifliche Weise über mich wachte und für mich sorgte" (V, 313).

The best-known instance occurred in Strassburg. Stilling needed five louis d'or within an hour as "Kollegiengeld," otherwise his medical course at the University would be at end. In the midst of his distress and prayer there came a knock at his bolted door, and an acquaintance dropped in to inquire whether all was well with him, and would he like to borrow eight louis d'or (I, 344-347). In the following years there were several other instances of God's last-minute responses to Stilling's prayers.

"Vernunft" and "Glaube" were still in conflict. "In dieser Gemüthsverfassung," he says, "wäre es wohl schwer gewesen, ein Bunianbuch zu schreiben, denn bloße Bilder der Imagination ohne gründliche Überzeugung der Wahrheit hinzustellen, das genügte mir nicht." In Strassburg he began a Bunyan book in hexameters, but his friends dissuaded him from the attempt. Later, in Heidelberg, he showed some new verses to a famous poet (name not given), who urged him to continue but he failed again because of his little faith (V, 314). Finally, in 1790 it pleased providence to reconcile for him "Vernunft" and "Glaube" and resolve his inner doubts.

Let us turn for a moment to the novel. In the course of his wanderings our pilgrim was led to the pyramids of Egypt. He was instructed at midnight to find and enter a secret opening. At first the passage was so narrow he had to take his oil lamp in his mouth and crawl in snakelike fashion for a certain distance; later he could rise to his hands and knees, still later stand with bended head. At length he found himself in a chamber the center of which was occupied by a statue of Horus. There was also a vase surmounted by a human head, a canopus. He was instructed to take a key and free the head, i.e., to release the "Halbge-

borenen." He found the key in the ear of the statue and did as directed. Then he sat on the lap of the statue which forthwith descended about fifty "Klafter." Releasing at every stage of his further exploration a "Halbgeborenen" and finding always in an ear or elsewhere a key to the proper exit, he continued on his way—first a half hour's walk to a rounded western chamber, then through the southern exit to a chamber containing a statue of Isis with four heads, of a woman, an eagle, a lion, and an ox, thence westward for a quarter hour to an arched chamber guarded by a cerberus, the middle head of which asked if he had freed the "Halbgeborenen"; on a satisfactory answer he was allowed to proceed through a passage longer than all the others to a large chamber. Here he sat on the lap of a statue of Harpokrates and was hoisted several "Klafter" upwards to his goal. Now the object of his adventure became clear. Here he found three gray "Felsenmänner" who wished to ask him his opinion about certain matters.

The following day the interrogation began: Is there anything beyond the confines of the universe? Was there ever any time before time began? Since Eugenius was unable to answer these and similar questions, he was deemed to have passed his examination and was advanced to a higher degree (IV, 393-420).

So now at length in 1790 the way was open for Heinrich Jung-Stilling to carry out his nearly life-long project. The Kantian philosophy, he says, "ist ein wahres unterirdisches Labyrinth ... Wer das Oellicht der Eingeweihten nicht mitnimmt und es nicht sorgfältig am Brennen erhält, der ist verloren, denn man kann wahrlich auf Abwege gerathen, die einen noch tiefer in den Abgrund des Zweifels stürzen" (V, 315). From Kant Jung-Stilling learned that human beings were limited in their perception of reality, and that, when faith and reason come into conflict, one should distrust the faulty evidence of reason and follow the light of faith. On this basis the theocracy of Solyman was founded.

The principality of Solyman extended over 300 German square miles and was a melting pot of races. There were 6,000 Parsee families (IV, 816), at least 25,000 subjects not including women and children. There were 24,000 Russians. There was a colony of Israelites. There were contingents of Tartars, Arabs, Turks, Tibetans, Kalmucks, and Cossacks, all of them good Christians. But western Europe could contribute only 35,000 souls and these were chiefly West German, for conditions in Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, England, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Poland, Austria, and above all France were not favorable for religious recruiting. There is no mention of Catholic con-

verts in Solyman. The pre-existence of a Holy Church Universal would have fitted in badly with Stilling's fictional scheme. There was also no room for anti-Catholic polemics.

In his Protestantism Stilling was irenic. We know that he was a member of the Reformed Church but neither in the *Heimweh* nor in the *Lebensgeschichte* is there any outspoken anti-Lutheranism. Jung-Stilling was opposed to mysticism and quietism, but he argues against Fénelon, Mme Guyon, and Teer-Steeger without rancor. He was on friendly terms with Mennonites, Herrenhuter, and Quakers. His holy war was waged against "der Geist der falschen Aufklärung." By the time Jung-Stilling had reached his Kantian equilibrium this spirit had become "Revolutionsgeist." Jung-Stilling had long before conceived of the France of Rousseau and Voltaire as the land of godlessness and of Paris as the capital city of luxury and of deism, and the French Revolution only dramatized the results.

It should be noted that Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* was not the sole literary ancestor of *Das Heimweh*. A reviewer in Berlin asserted that Stilling's narrative was an imitation of Hamann's *Kreuz- und Querzüge des Ritters von A bis Z*, a work which Stilling had never read. Equally amiss was the statement that it was an imitation of Fénelon's *Télémaque*. Stilling acknowledges quite different indebtednesses:

> Ich hatte kürzlich von *Tristram Shandy* von Lorenz Sterne gelesen; die launigte und sentinöse Schreibart dieses Buchs hatte mich überzeugt, daß, wenn man diesen Styl reinigte, ich möchte fast sagen, heiligte, wie schon in [Hippels] *Lebensläufen in aufsteigender Linie* auf eine ganz vorzügliche Weise geschehen ist, ein ganz besonders großer Nutzen daraus entstehen würde; jetzt wählte ich also diese Schreibart [V, 317].

It should be noted that Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* had long been known to Stilling. Goethe, in Strassburg, "gab ihm in Ansehung der schönen Wissenschaften einen anderen Schwung. Er machte ihn mit Ossian, Shakespeare, Fielding und Sterne bekannt" (I, 350).

Readers of *Das Heimweh* should be prepared to expect few traces of *Tristram Shandy's* "launigte und sentinöse Schreibart" in Stilling's work. *Das Heimweh* differs from its prototype in its greater length and broader geographical span, in its acceptance of Kant's philosophy, and in the erudition that Jung-Stilling had acquired by his fifty-eighth year, when he settled down to carry out his nearly life-long project.

University of California, Berkeley

SANTINA C. VIAL

Equicola and the School of Lyons

THE LITERARY relations of Mario Equicola with France, that is, his own knowledge and utilization of French sources, have been thoroughly explored by Professor Camillo Merlino.[1] The influence of Equicola on French authors, however, has hardly been touched upon, except in footnotes of critical editions which, in most cases, provide only general references. His name appears also, occasionally, in treatises dealing with Platonist currents in sixteenth-century France, along with other often much better known authors: Ficino, Pico, Bembo, Castiglione, through whose writings the thought of the Greek philosopher spread across the Alps.[2]

Yet Equicola's contacts with France were close and frequent. He accompanied his patroness, Isabella d'Este, on her trip to Provence in 1507 and published an account of the trip in his book, *Iter in Narbonensem Galliam* (1517). He was present at Blois at the signing of the peace treaty between France and Spain in 1505, and his correspondence in the Gonzaga archives at Mantua contains many keen political comments on that event.[3] He seems to have enjoyed the confidence of Louis XII, who loaned him books from his library. Equicola also wrote a book in praise of France, *Apologia pro Gallia*, which was translated into French by Roté and published in Paris in 1550. His most famous work, *Libro de natura de amore*, was translated into French by G. Chappuys

[1] Camillo Merlino, "French Studies of Mario Equicola," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XIV (1929).

[2] See particularly Jean Festugière, *La Philosophie de l'amour de Marsile Ficin et son influence sur la littérature française du XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1941).

[3] Archivio Gonzaga, Busta 864 ms.

in 1584, and had four editions in a short time.[4] But the popularity of Equicola in France did not wait upon the translation of his works. Italian was the second language at court, and all the cultured people of the time read and spoke the language. We find original editions of the *De natura* in Montaigne's library, and Equicola is mentioned in the *Essais*.[5] The authors of the school of Lyons, Louise Labé, Maurice Scève, Héroet, had certainly read him in the Italian text. *De natura* had had fourteen printings in Italy between 1525 and 1626.

In a previous paper,[6] I have endeavored to show the great reputation that Equicola enjoyed among his contemporaries in Italy. The French authors may well have known him, at first, through some other Italian writer. And it is not impossible, although less probable, that the French, who in the sixteenth century frequently traveled in Italy, may have known the *De natura* in manuscript. The book was probably composed during the last years of the fifteenth and the first years of the sixteenth century and circulated widely in manuscript before 1525, when it was first printed.

The writers of the Lyons group were Platonist in thought and Petrarchist in technique. Their Platonism was inspired for the most part by Marsilio Ficino. There was, then, a community of background between these writers and Equicola, who, as a former member of the Accademia del Pontano, was an avowed Platonist. But there is evidence that, if the general philosophical inspiration of the authors of the school of Lyons comes from Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, and other well-known Italian humanists, some aspects or applications of that philosophy have their source in Equicola's book, *De natura*.

There are striking similarities between Héroet's major work, *La parfaicte amye* (1542), and the *De natura de amore*, not only in thought, which might be explained by a common Platonist source, but also in

[4] *Les six livres de Mario Equicola ... de la Nature d'Amour, tant humain que divin* ... Mis en français par Gabriel Chappuys tourangeau (Paris, 1584). Another edition appeared in 1589. Festugière mentions a Paris edition dated 1598. But this is probably a mistaken reference to a Lyons edition of the same date, mentioned by Renier, "Per la cronologia e la composizione del Libro de Natura de Amore di Mario Equicola." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XIV (1889), 212-233. An edition of Chappuys' translation published in Lyons in 1597 is in the British Museum.

[5] Montaigne, *Essais*, Livre III, Chap. V (V, 128, ed. Strowski). See Pierre Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais* (Paris, 1893), I, 137.

[6] "Mario Equicola in the Opinion of his Contemporaries," *Italica*, XXXIV (1957), 202-221.

expression and in the application and extension of Platonist ideas.[7] In an article on A. Héroet's *Parfaicte amye*, W. A. R. Kerr calls attention to a "very remarkable" theory which Héroet elaborates in that poem:

> Our souls before being summoned to put on earthly bodies were engaged in heaven in the contemplation of divine beauty; after birth the memory of the previous state is practically lost, but a remembrance of it is vouchsafed to those who here below love truly. Then the experience of love brings back to the lover a recollection of his former bliss, and with this standard of eternal beauty in mind, the lover is now able rightly to measure earthly beauty as a part and pattern of the beauty which pervades and transfuses the universe...[8]

Héroet appears to go a step beyond his contemporaries who, basing themselves pretty squarely on Plato's *Symposium*, held only that the lover was insensibly raised by the contemplation of human beauty—especially as typified in a woman—to the comprehension of celestial beauty. Héroet, however, makes it clear that a spiritual love of woman may awaken recollection of a prenatal experience of heavenly beauty, which then becomes our standard and enables us to judge correctly the nature and meaning of that physical beauty with which we have fallen in love. A comparison between the lines quoted below will show not only that the working of the idea of the prototypes is the same in Héroet and Equicola, but that "the remarkable theory" pointed out by Kerr is in the *De natura*:

...l'anima alata... si recorda della bellezza divina, repiglia le ali colle quali vola alla contemplatione di cose celesti considerate nel simulacro dell'amata havendo sempre suo intento alla divina pulcritudine, la quale pel viso reconosce... [*De natura*, p. 40].

Chi sotto l'amorosa disciplina vive... al fin dalla corporea bellezza alla incorporea, la strada al salir al ciel santamente ne mostra [*De natura*, pp. 91 and verso].

Et que beaulté divine congneussions, / Depuis tombés en ces terrestres corps, / Que nulz n'estoyent de ce temps là records, / Sinon bien peu, ausquelz estoit permis / De se nommer et estre vrays amys; / Et qui de belle amy plus devenoit, / C'estoit celluy qui mieulx se souvenoit / D'avoir au ciel auparavant esté / Contemplateur de divine beaulté; / Qu'amour icy nous donnoit soubvenance, / Le soubvenir causait l'intelligence / De la beauté ça bas mal entendue... / Jusques au temps que

[7] Héroet belonged to a renowned family, and his father, Jehan Héroet, had been secretary to the Duke of Orléans who, in 1498, succeeded Charles VIII as Louis XII. L. G. Pélissier, in his *Documents pour l'histoire de la domination française dans le Milanais* (Toulouse, 1891), quotes an official document dated June 23, 1502, in which a certain "Maestro Zoanne Erouet" is designated as "trésorier général des finances à Milan." This is in all likelihood Antoine Héroet's father, who would then have been in Milan at the time of Equicola's frequent visits to that city.

[8] W. A. R. Kerr, "Antoine Héroet's *Parfaite Amye*," *PMLA*, XX (1905), 578-579.

l'anima a poco a poco se medesima reconoscendo se ricorda delle cose divine da lei vedute in cielo, e cosi incitata dal furor amatorio ama le cose belle. Segregata d'ogni studio humano, e fissa nella divina contemplatione vedendo qui nel mondo qualche similitudine e sembianza di quel che vide, quando dal cielo discese, le resguarda e le stupisce; de qui procede estasi e alienatione di mente [*De natura*, p. 81 verso].

l'aisle soit rendue[9] [*Parfaicte amye*, II, lines 899-913].

Cela [love] ne vient d'humaine affection / Ny de la terre, ainsi que nous pensons; / Il vient du ciel, dont nous recongnoissons / Ceste beaulté de femme estre sortie, / Et nous souvient du tout par la partie; / Il nous souvient de la saison passée, / De la beaulté, qu'au ciel avons laissée. / Nostre ame crainct qu'estant au corps liée, / Par son oubly du beau soit oubliée. / Puis tout soubdain par sa recongnoissance / Elle s'asseure, et entre en esperance, / Puis que d'ung tel soubvenir est saysie, / Que beaulté l'a preesleue et choisie / A s'eslever; si commence d'entendre / Combien de perte elle fist, de descendre, / Veult refrener toutes passions vaines, / Use d'amour et de beaultés humaines / Pour ung degré propre à plus haulte attente [*Parfaicte amye*, II, lines 932-949].

In the first book of *La parfaicte amye*, Héroet expresses a thought which, it is true, was rather frequent among the imitators of Petrarch in France, that is, that love is similar to death. This is also found in Equicola; the expressions in the two authors are so strikingly similar that Héroet's verses could be taken for a translation of the *De natura*.

Se altri volontaria morte il nomina, qualunque fu non erro, essendo il vero amatore nel suo corpo, e vivo in quello dell'amata. O fortunata morte, per laqual il morir è vita, e morendo se riduplica e fa gemino [*De natura*, p. 89 verso].

O cueurs heureux! ô felicité d'eulx, / Quand pour ung seul on en recouvre deux! / O beau mourir, pour en celluy revivre, / La mort duquel double vie delivre! [*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 143-146].

The description of Cupid is also rather commonplace among the Platonist writers of the sixteenth century, and both *La parfaicte amye* and the *De natura* contain such descriptions. Here again the similarities are so pronounced that we may assume that Héroet was familiar with the Italian text. Both descriptions take as their point of departure the great varieties found among the ancients in the picture they present of the god of love:

[9] Quotations are taken from the edition of Equicola's *De natura* published in Venice in 1636 by Pietro di Nicolini da Sabbio, and from Héroet's *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Ferdinand Gohin, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1943).

Fu posto in controversia da antiqui, perché Cupido se pinga fanciullo, perche alato, perche armato di face e saette. Aristophane li da le ale auree, putto se dipinge che di ragion ne priva, e putti ne fa parere, pero li è superchio il velo nanzi a gli occhi; Alessandro il pinge putto, e qualche volta grandetto dice descriversi; Giove di Luciano lo chiama piu antiquo di Rapeto, e astutissimo vecchio... [*De natura*, p. 68].

J'ay veu l'Amour en pourtraict en divers lieux / L'ung le painct vieil, cruel, et furieux, / L'aultre, plus doulx, enfant, aveugle et nud; / Chacun le tient pour tel qu'il l'a cogneu / Par ses bienfaicts ou par sa forfaicture [*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 1-5].

Héroet also seems to offer an implicit criticism of Equicola, who, in his usual heavy display of erudition, discusses at length the diverse origins attributed to Cupid by ancient authors. Héroet does not care about these purely scholarly problems:

> Je me tairay de ses diversités [of Cupid]
> De sa puissance et de ses deitès:
> Il ne me chault si Venus fut sa mère,
> S'il fut seul filz, ou s'il avoit ung frère.
> (*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 15-18)

It is curious that, having dismissed contemptuously the question of whether Cupid had or did not have a brother, Héroet comes back to this problem and resolves it in the affirmative. In so doing, he gives us irrefutable proof of his indebtedness to Equicola. Héroet wrote a poem entitled "Aultre invention extraicte de Platon" as a sequence to his poem, "Androgyne de Platon." He relates therein the story of Cupid's little brother, the origin of the brother, and the significance of the fable, and attributes the story to Plato. Festugière made the discovery[10] that the fable, which is not in Plato or in any of the Italian humanists in vogue in France in the sixteenth century, is found in Equicola, who claims to have discovered it in Themistius. The first known edition of Themistius' work bears the imprint of Venice, 1524; Equicola must have consulted the work in manuscript. *De natura* relates the fable of Cupid and of his brother Anteros, and Equicola gives an interpretation of it which he claims to be his own. The following texts show once again the striking similarities of thought and expression between Héroet and Equicola. Equicola's text is preceded by a lengthy enumeration of the opinions of ancient writers on Cupid.

Di Themistio poneremo le parole nel idioma nostra converse, nel tempo che Venere genero Cupido bello e venusto si vedea quel putto molto piu bello che

Vénus pensant que son filz doulz et plaisant / Tant tendrelet, le preux contrefaisant... / Craignant que luy, noisif et ennemy, / Semblant toujours en-

[10] Which Gohin recognizes in his second edition (1943), *op. cit.*, p. 90.

la bella madre, ma non cresceva in grandezza e statura, la quale correspondesse alla bellezza. Per laqual cosa anxia non sapendo quel che fare la madre, tutta si affligeva, similmente le gratie del putto nutrici, pilche (?) andarno al oracolo di Themis (non era anchora Apollo in Delphi) pregando supplici che qualche rimedio se trovasse a quella insolita e degna di misericordia, infelicità. Themis disse: Io ve levaro di questa sollecitudine. Certamente non me par habbiate ben compresa la natura e ingegno del putto, perche o Venere questo tuo vero amore forsi puo nascere solo, crescere non puo solo, pero se disideri che cresca te è necessaria l'opera di Anatherote, il quale con reciproco amore risponda alla benevolentia. Sera cosi la natura delli fratelli che l'uno a l'altro sera authore di farse crescere riguardandose mutuamente da equal pianta. Se l'uno mancara, sera necessario manchino ambidue. In questo modo Venere parturi Antherote, il quale appena nato subito Cupido crescette in alto e esplico le penne: gia camminava grande, essendo addito a questa sorte molte volte è vessato da male, mo cresce, mo decresce: cosi sempre ha bisogno della presentia del fratello quale sel vede diventar grande, esso se sforza diventar maggiore e se conosce quello esser piccolo, ello diventa di mala voglia e languido. Denota Themistio che chi vuol essere amato, bisogna amare, che lo amore se non è mutuo manca [*De natura,* pp. 65 verso, 66 verso].[11]

fant d'an et demy, / Après avoir tant d'hommes combattu, / Ne fust d'aulcun plus fort que lui battu, / S'esbaissant que si long temps passoit / Et que jamais sa taille ne croissoit, / Voulant d'un Dieu, qui pour lors respondoit / La verité de ce qu'on demandoit, / Sçavoir au vray pour quelle forfaicture / Punye estoit si belle creature, / Quelle raison La Nature mouvoit, / Et quel secours et remede y avoit: / Dame Venus, respondit la Prophete, / Ainsi que Dieu nous dict et interprete / Blasmer n'en faut nature ny fortune, / Ton fils, ny toy, ny creature aulcune. / Dieu, sachant bien que tu n'as congnoissance / De ton enfant ny de sa longue enfance, / M'a commandé de dire à toy sa mere / Qu'il serait grand, si se voyoit un frere... / Mais si tu veux qu'ung Cupido semblable / Te fasse Mars ou aultre myeulx aymé / Ce qu'il pourra seulement tascher estre, / Le filz aisné s'efforcera de croistre: / Car luy, qui a victorieux vescu, / Ne peut de Dieu n'y d'homme estre vaincu... / Car le puisné le filz aisné provoque; / Lequel voyant son frere reciproque / En peu de temps se pouvoir advancer / De grandeur veult comme d'age passer. / Ainsi concluds que l'homme n'est blasmé / S'il ayme peu quand il n'est point aymé; / Le faire ainsi nature luy commande ["Aultre invention," lines 1-40, 79-85].

Both writers express the idea that love which comes spontaneously is of divine origin and should not be opposed. Equicola treats the theme in Book V of *De natura,* in a chapter entitled "Virtu, diligentia, modi, e arte de conciliare benivolentia."

[11] Festugière, *op. cit.,* p. 160, takes this text from the Venice edition of 1636. The text quoted in this article is from the same edition, yet it differs in many respects from Festugière's. In some places, Festugière has obviously modernized the spelling; there are many other differences.

Non repugnate o nobilissime donne ad amore quando volontario viene, che allora dal cielo essere non si deve dubitare, questo sempre è buono ne mai parturisce mali effetti [*De natura*, p. 166].

De l'amytié, qui est du ciel venue, / Et que depuis j'ay fatalle tenue, / M'appercevant que sa forte racine / Issue estoit de voulunté divine. / Or semble amour, à qui vouldra péché / Puis que le ciel du mien s'est empesché, / Non seulement de luy je me contente, / Mais davantage aux dames je me vente / Que, si divin fut son commencement, / Entretenu je l'ay divinement [*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 105-114].

Both Héroet and Equicola insist on the necessity for hope and perseverance in a successful pursuit of love. Equicola develops the thought in the chapter, "Virtu, diligentia, etc.," which starts with the pithy sentence: "Chi non spera non ama lungamente." Héroet writes:

> Quand le veirrez de travail tourmenté
> Et de refus d'elle mal contenté,
> Asseurez vous par sa perseverance,
> Qu'il en a eu pour le moins esperance.
> (*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 253-256)

Both authors give the same kind of advice to the lady. Her favors should not be too easily won. She should be discreet to be enticing.

Tal consiglio do hora io a donne, e pregevole che loro giudicio sia tale, che con l'avaritia non causeno odio, ne con la prodigalita si generono fastidio. Non mi dispiace che se facciano desiderare. Perche li doni piu grati sono e maggior volupta apportano negati alquanto, se poi gratiosamente son porti [*De natura*, p. 166 verso].

Je ne dy pas qu'il ne faille celer / Sa volunté et que dissimuler / En temps et en lieu ne face une subjette / Estre et sembler à son amy discrette; / Mais craindre fault que soubz discretion / Ne se nourisse aulcune affection. / Et à la fin que ce desguisement / Contente plus que le contentement [*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 275-282].

Both agree that true love brings moral improvement and even perfection in virtue:

Questo [i.e., Amore] è datore liberalissimo d'ogni virtu eccitatore di tutte le laudabili operazioni, e ornamento. [*De natura*, p. 166 verso].

D'amy parfaict vient ma perfection / ... / Sans vraye amour, sans foy, et sans sçavoir, / Rien ne se peult attaindre ny avoir [*Parfaicte amye*, I, lines 488, 492-493].

Even contradictions between two authors, when they deal with a strictly specific point, can be used as an argument to establish at least that one had read the other, and can serve to strengthen the proofs of influence adduced by comparisons of similarities. It would seem that Héroet aimed specifically at Equicola's opinion on the role played by

the goddess Fortune in the vicissitudes of lovers. Héroet contends that love is above Fortune and in fact determines Fortune, while Equicola attributes to the goddess a decisive influence.

Confessano molti te [i.e., Fortune] non solamente dispensatrice delle humane attioni, ma che amore, come perito Palinuro in alto mare nave, sola inciti e rivolgi; Noi in le tue mani il mutuo amore reponemo... [*De natura*, p. 119 verso].

Je dys qu'amour est dessoubz la nature, / Dessus fortune, et ne crainct adventure / N'aultre accident; mais à eulx tout / commande [*Parfaicte amye*, III, lines 1577-80].

Héroet and Equicola both admit that love arises from a similitude of mind, of dispositions, and of bodily qualities. Equicola, as is his custom, develops that thought more amply than Héroet, with many philosophical arguments.

Noi, non negamo in conservatione d'amore, similitudine de natura... la similitudine de forma, aspetto, membri lineamenti puo causare benivolentia, perche da tal proportione qualche actione dell'animo si comprende, e se non in ogni atto, in alcuno ci trovano simili ... [*De natura*, p. 124 verso].

Pensez qu'amour vient de similitude / Tant d'esperits que de complexions. [*Parfaicte amye*, III, lines 1642-43].

Another important parallel may be drawn in the manner in which the two authors use the myth of the Androgyne. Héroet treats the theme in a poem, Equicola in the chapter entitled "Causa che ne inclina ad amar piu una persona che un altra." Both authors explain the origin of love, its aberrations, and why we love one person and not another and often choose one less beautiful and less deserving as the subject of our affection. The myth of the Androgyne had been translated from the *Symposium* by Ficino and was easily accessible to sixteenth-century writers. Marguerite de Navarre, Pontus de Tyard, Joachim du Bellay, among others, relate the myth with slight modifications.[12] Although Héroet's story is much less detailed than that in the *Symposium* and in the *De natura*, it follows substantially the same pattern. Yet it would appear that his version is nearer Equicola than Plato, at least in the applications that Héroet and Equicola make of the myth to explain the incessant and restless search until the desired object is found—the other half of the lover's personality split by the order of Jupiter. It will suffice to compare the conclusions which follow the relation of the story.

[12] Gohin, *op. cit.*, p. 64, note.

Da quel tempo in qua fu innato l'amor dell'huomo a l'huomo, sforzandosi di due far uno. E adunque ciascuno di noi mezzo e ciascuno cerca il suo resto, cio è questo stirpe donde fu separato. Se questo per caso si contra, di quelli è amor vehementissimo, e quelli se amano per tutto tempo de lor vita. Questa favola che credemo altro ne apporta ... Si comprende, che ad alcuni ne piace compiaciere, e semo non solamente inclinati a gratificarli, ma da non so che, che quasi violentati osseguirli. Da alcuni del solo aspetto si prende molestia, tutto credeno accascare da pari, ovvero repugnante complessione. Molte volte fra belle donne, una men bella con fermo vinculo liga [*Da natura*, p. 120].

Tel bien on dit proprement amytié, / Recouvrement de perdue moytié; / Auquel chascun doibt jetter son desir. / Le danger est de ne sçavoir choisir / Et d'endurer hontes et vituperes, / Qu' eurent jadis les dessudicts noz peres, / Avant qu'avoir de leur bien congnoissance. / Aulcunes foys nous prenons accointance / Avec part, que nostre pensons estre; / Mais quand ce vient a plus pres la congnoistre, / En se trouvant aux approches emblées, / Le tout conjoinct et pieces rassemblées, / Tout deux deceus et abusés se sentent, / Et vont ailleurs; car point ne se contentent, / Bien qu'il y ayt reciproque beaulté ["Androgyne," lines 227-241].

It is also interesting to note that both Héroet and Equicola interpret the myth in a Christian sense, as an obscure Platonist intuition of the dogma of the fall of man and the division into spiritual and sensual parts which seek to be rejoined.

Con mirabile harmonia l'anima et corpo son insieme uniti; pero dalla proportione del corpo e sua figuratione possersi giudicare li concetti dell'anima, sommi e preclari ingegni credono. Non negano pero poterci noi dalli naturali impulsi, per ragione contenere, e con quella ogni perturbatione rimovere, col freno di quella rafrenare le concupiscentie; e convertire a studio di vertu [*De natura*, p. 120 and verso].

... vous [King Francis I, to whom the poem is dedicated] voyez que les sages / Nous ont souvent figurés es images, / Pour nous donner entière remembrance / De nous, dont plus n'avons de soubvenance / Nous montre l'ame en ceste terre immonde, / L'amour divin par celluy de ce monde, / Comme voirrons en la descouverture / De nostre double estrange creature / ... / [The soul] fust separée / Dieu a la part meilleure retirée; / L'aultre est au corps de terre environnée / ... / Tout ses voeux sont de se redemander / ... / Elle aime Dieu et requit sa moytié ... ["Androgyne," *passim*, lines 301-395].

In the second book of *La parfaicte amye*, Héroet relates the fable of the men on the Fortunate Isles whose thoughts were visible. These islands, described by Plato in the *Critias*, enjoyed a great vogue in the literature of the Renaissance. We find allusions to them in the *Cortegiano* and in the *Gerusalemme liberata*. However, the scheme employed by the queen to read the thoughts of those who wish to reside in the islands is found neither in *Critias* nor in *Phaedo*, which describes the

realm of happy souls as quite similar to the Fortunate Isles. The entire fable as told by Héroet occurs in Bembo's *Asolani*,[13] related by the hermit to Lavinello. This could well be the source used by Héroet. However, it is curious that the manuscript of the *De natura* in the National University Library of Torino contains exactly the description of the scheme as it is found in Héroet, in a chapter on N. Francesco Prudenzio D'Alvito, nephew of Equicola, which was later omitted in the printed edition: "Apollo delphico meritatamente indicò Socrate piú che li altri savio, Di costui essere stato sententia si dice haver la natura errato in non fare li poeti deli homini fenestrati, *ad ciò* li sensi nostri fusseno manifesti, et i vitii non si potessero occultare."[14] These *homini fenestrati*, whose thoughts are read through windows obviously placed on their foreheads, resemble the men described by Héroet who "Dessus leurs fronts sont leurs songes escripts" (*Parfaicte amye*, II, line 1078). Added to other evidence, this resemblance on a point of detail not mentioned by Plato may well indicate that Héroet had read Equicola in manuscript.

La parfaicte amye is one of a trilogy of poems which constituted the center of a literary quarrel on the merits of woman and love as they had been set forth in the third book of the *Cortegiano*; the other two poems are *L'Amie de court* by La Borderie (1541) and *La Contr'amye de court* by Charles Fontaine (1541). It would have been interesting to analyze the latter poems for possible relations with the *De natura*. Unfortunately they are not available in the United States. We must rest with the opinion expressed on the subject by R. L. Hawkins, which in part satisfies our curiosity:

> Whoever reads carefully Fontaine's *Contr'Amye de Court* and *Épître, philosophant sur la bonne amour*, and Héroët's *Parfaicte Amye*, and examines the parallel ideas in Héroët's and Fontaine's poem will, I am sure, be convinced that, in so far as essential ideas are concerned, the Platonism of the two poets is virtually identical ... Fontaine and Héroët were friends who had studied Plato's doctrines, who had perhaps conversed about them, and who in answering the same poem, La Borderie's *Amie de Court* based their answers on the writings of the same authors ...[15] The *Contr'Amye de Court* and the *Épitre* contain every essential idea of Héroët's *Parfaicte Amye* except one.[16]

There is at least a good probability that the borrowings from Equicola

[13] Festugière has also identified this source (*op. cit.*, pp. 158-159). Bembo, *Asolani*, in *Prose scelte*, ed. F. Costero (Milan, 1880), p. 132.

[14] As quoted in Renier, *loc. cit.*

[15] R. L. Hawkins, *Maistre Charles Fontaine, Parisien* (Cambridge, Mass., 1916) p. 112.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 235-236.

certainly present in Héroet would be found also in Charles Fontaine and in La Borderie.

When we look for possible influence of Equicola on other members of the school of Lyons, the evidence is not so conclusive. Louise Labé certainly knew the *De natura*, and her description of Cupid seems to have been inspired by that of Equicola. Her Cupid possesses the same attributes as those mentioned in the chapter, "Forza et potentia d'amore," in the *De natura*. The god of love is ageless, he is all-powerful; great and small gods, good and evil spirits, succumb to him. Love is beyond forfeit and laws:

D'Amore tutta la terra e mare son pieni, e ciascuno il sente... Questo non ne permette osservare delle leggi la norma. Questo induce a violare editti, sprezzare constitutioni, contennere amicitie... amor solo merita d'essere adorato: per esser la sua potentia si grande et in cielo et nel abisso et qui fra noi. Seneca dice costui regnare potente in ogni terra, abbruciare Giove con fiamme indomite, Marte bellicoso sentir la face di costui: Aristote nel terzo della poetica scrisse, esser fama una giovane esser stata fatta gravida da un demone ... Li poeti con figmenti la forza d'amore ne mostrano: questi cantano quel sommo Giove delli dei et huomini padre et governatore che ciel regge, in varie figure mutato, Tauro, Diana, oro, Aquila, Cigno, Amphitrione, fuoco, pastore, serpente... Et Nettuno mo divinuto giuvenco, mo fiume... Non voglio altre cose favolose referire, lasciando le fugitive, et molte volte prese nimphe, Naiade, Driade, Amadriade, lascivi Satiri... [*De natura*, pp. 130 verso, 135, 136, 137 verso, 138 verso].

Le ciel et la terre en rendent temoignage. Il n'y a lieu ou n'aie laisse quelque trofée. [Cupid is talking.] Regarde au ciel tous les sieges des Dieux. et t'interroge si quelqu'un d'entre eux s'est pu eschapper de mes mains. Commence au vieil Saturne, Jupiter, Mars, Apolon, et finis aux Demidieux, Satires, Faunes, et Sylvains, Et n'auront les Déesses d'en confesser quelque chose. Et ne m'a Pallas epouvanté de son bouclier: Mais ne l'ai voulu interrompre de ses sutils ouvrages, où jour et nuit elle s'employe. Baisse toi en terre, et dis si tu trouveras gens de marque qui ne soient ou aient été des miens. Voy en la furieuse mer, Neptune et ses Tritons, me prêtant obeissance. Penses-tu que les infernaus s'en exemptent? Ne les ai-je fait sortir de leurs abimes, et venir epouvanter les humains, et ravir les filles a leurs meres: quelques juges qu'ils soient de tels forfaits et transgressions faits contre les loix [Louise Labé, *Débat de folie et d'amour*, I, 10-11].[17]

A parallel may also be established between Scévole de Sainte-Marthe's description of the powers of love and the above text of Equicola:

> Amour est le vainqueur des dieux et des humains,
> Il arme d'un brandon ses redoubtables mains,
> Il fait craindre partout sa poignante sagette,

[17] Louise Labé, *Œuvres*, ed. Ch. Boy (Paris, 1887). The original edition was published in Lyon in 1555, by Jean de Tournes.

Et Tient dessous sa loy toute chose subiette,
En la mer, en la terre, et jusque dans les cieux...
Jupiter mainte fois ton outrage a senti,
Et sous un habit faux son estre a dementi,
Forcé d'abandonner ses cieux et son tonnerre,
Pour s'en venir aimer en ceste basse terre,
Ores en un Serpent, ores en un Taureau,
Tantot devenant un folastre Satyre,
Puis un feu, puis un Aigle, et puis un Cygne doux,
Changeant et rechangeant de forme à tous les coups:
Neptune mesme aussi vestit un corps liquide,
Pour douter à son gré la Nymphe Salmonide:
Et quelques fois encor ce puissant Dieu marin
A bien voulu choisir la forme d'un dauphin,
D'un belier, d'un cheval...
(*De l'amour*, pp. 57-60)[18]

It is also interesting to compare the role of destiny in the same poem of Sainte-Marthe with Equicola's application of the myth of the Androgyne:

Somme c'est le Destin qui met les cœurs ensemble,
C'est luy-mesmes aussi qui les cœurs desassemble,
De là viendra souvent qu'un homme qui sera
Pauvre, vil et difforme, à son gré jouira
D'une qui pour neant est longtemps courtisee
Par quelqu'un riche et beau qui luy sert de risee.
Et de là vient aussi qu'une femme dedaigne
Bien souvent le mary qui la prend à compagne,
Bien qu'il soit beau, gentil, et de bon lieu venu,
Pour aimer un faquin ou quelque homme inconnu.
Bref s'il n'estoit ainsi que fussent dispensees
Les passions d'Amour aux humaines pensees
Selon que le destin à chacun les depart,
Un seul homme pourra sans qu'on en face doute
Et toute femme aimer et estre aime de toute...

As for Equicola's interpretation of the myth of Anteros, we find it repeated in some of the poems of Mellin de Saint-Gelais:

Selon l'amour que l'on vous porte,
La vostre devient foible ou forte.
Ainsi faict voile ou se retire
Le Nau, selon que le vent tire.
(*Œuvres*, III, 149)[19]

Also in the following:

[18] Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, *Œuvres* (1579). A copy of this work is in the Princeton University Library.
[19] *Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain (Paris, 1873).

Que peut Amour s'il ne peut contenter
Et de nostre heur se nourrir et accroistre?
S'il est enfant, il se doit augmenter.
(*Œuvres*, 11, 121)

With regard to Maurice Scève, the leader of the school of Lyons, V. Saulnier says: "Scève a platonisé, pétrarquisé, mais on ne trouve pas dans *Délie* comme par exemple dans la *Parfaicte amye*, de ces tirades expressives derrière lesquelles se laisse deviner tout proche, le texte platonicien."[20] It is difficult to extricate the sources of Scève's works; however, we may note certain similarities of some of his expressions and some of his concepts with those of Equicola. For example, in the pastoral poem *La Saulsaye* the description of Philerne, unhappy in love, and Equicola's description of the youth in love:

Ores tout morne avec chere avalee...
Je ne te voy fors bras et mains destordre
A basse voix, et mots entre coupez,
De maints soupirs par sanglots sincopez,
Qui (tout ainsi qu'en estroite fornaise
On voit grand feu sortir mal à son ayse)
Dedans ta bouche ensemble s'entrebattent:
Qu'on te diroit, non en le recitant,
Mais à te voir, quelque febricitant...
(*La Saulsaye*, lines 20-30)[21]

In dizain 37 of Scève's *Délie*, we find an enumeration of the physical attributes of Cupid, which could well be a summary of the chapter entitled "Di Cupidine" in the *De natura*.

In the same chapter, Equicola refutes the opinion of those who say that among the arrows of Cupid are some of gold and some of lead, to signify that contraries must be cured with contraries. Equicola's interpretation is that the gold arrows signify the fervor and warmth of love, whereas the lead arrows represent cold, melancholy:

Benché se potria verosimilmente l'oro, metallo prestantissimo che non patisce rugine, al qual predomina il Sole signor del sangue propia complessione d'amore, significare ferventia d'amare. Il piombo frigidissimo col quale como fece Calvo Oratore se ristinge Venere dedicato a Saturno signor della melancolica complessione nota il fuggir chi te ama... L'oro puo assai anzi il tutto dalla saetta del quale se è percossa l'anima se è avara consente al desiderio del amatore [*De natura de amore*, pp. 68 verso, 69].

Scève is in perfect agreement:

[20] V. Saulnier, *Maurice Scève* (Paris, 1948), I, 147.
[21] *Œuvres complètes de Maurice Scève*, ed. Bertrand Guégan (Paris, 1927).

Aussi, ô Dieu, en noz cœurs tu estens
L'Amour par l'Or plaisant, chault, attractif.
Et par le Plomb tu nous rendz mal contentz,
Comme mol, froid, pesant, et retrainctif.
(*Délie*, dizain 37)

Mais par ce traict [i.e., of gold] atrayant Amour pris
Fut asservy soub l'avare puissance.
(*Délie*, dizain 36)

Compare also lines 1-2 of Scève's *Microcosme* with the lines of the *De natura* which describe the Holy Trinity:

Dio omnipotente, Il medesimo (como dice Augustino) tripotente, padre, figliuolo, e spirito santo Monade trina alla precettione de' suoi sacri misteri ne mena... [*De natura* p. 95].

Dieu, qui trine en un fus, triple es et trois sera, / Et, comme tes Eleus nous eterniseras.

Interesting similarities can also be pointed out between Equicola's and Scève's descriptions of the absolute nature of the Deity:

In quella assolutissima natura immobile, d'ogni moto authore, in quella sempiterna vita, e indefessa providentia non esservi affetti tutti philosophi senza discrepantia, e catholicamente nostri Theologi affermano. Niuno affetio, niuna perturbatione si puo in la divina mente intromettere, per esser solo intelletto senza alteratione... e che contiene in se il tutto... per esser somma bonta, et bene [*De natura*, p. 92 verso].

Essence pleine en soy d'infinité latente, / Qui seule en soy se plait, et seule se contente / Non agente, impassible, immuable, invisible / Dans son Eternité, comme incomprehensible, / Et qui de soy en soy estant sa jouissance / Consistait en Bonté, Sapience, et Puissance [*Délie*, pp. 11-17].

It would seem justified to attribute to Equicola a larger share than heretofore acknowledged in shaping the thought and the mode of expression of the poets of the school of Lyons. If we consider the eclectic style of the *De natura* and the wealth of information that it contains, we can guess that it may well have saved these authors, at times, the trouble of consulting the *Greek Anthology*. As for the philosopher and chief Platonist of the group, Antoine Héroet, his debt to Equicola can no longer be doubted.

Fordham University

W. U. McDONALD, JR.

Inglis' *Rambles*: A Romantic Tribute To *Don Quixote*

IN THE SAME YEAR that Victoria ascended the English throne, and *Oliver Twist, The French Revolution,* and Lockhart's *Life of Scott* were published, Whittaker and Company of London issued a volume of 203 pages entitled *Rambles in the Footsteps of Don Quixote.* Illustrated by Cruikshank, it was written by Henry David Inglis, journalist and author of numerous travel books (including *Spain in 1830*) and of a would-be picaresque novel (*Pedro of Peñaflor, or The New Gil Blas*). *Rambles* was praised by the *Monthly Review*[1] for providing sensitive criticism of Cervantes' novel, a clear picture of Spain, and a pleasant collection of sketches, and by the *Literary Gazette*[2] for passages "not unworthy of Le Sage, or of Cervantes himself."

Today a reader would hardly assent to the *Gazette's* estimate, but could probably agree that the book is pleasant. More important, it was the first extensive English comment on Cervantes' novel published in fifty years and the first book built around the novel, if we exclude translations with their primarily biographical prefaces.[3]

---

[1] XXI, (1837), 599-611.

[2] Nov. 25, 1837, p. 745. See also *New Monthly Magazine,* NS, LII (1838), 133-135; *Gentleman's Magazine,* CLXIII (1838), 175-177; and *Dublin University Magazine,* XI (1838), 574-581. The *Athenaeum,* which had wished for just such a book by Inglis (1831, p. 405), abstained through irritation at the admittedly extravagant preface by an overzealous admirer (1838, p. 67).

[3] The only extensive commentary was in the critical apparatus of the Rev. John Bowle's 1781 edition of *Don Quixote* published separately in English and in Spanish. See Jeremiah D. M. Ford and Ruth Lansing, *Cervantes: A Tentative Bibliography of his Works and of Biographical and Critical Material Concerning Him* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), pp. 7, 199.

A slight revision and a considerable expansion of a four-part literary pilgrimage which had originally appeared in the *Englishman's Magazine* in 1831 under the title "Recent Rambles in the Footsteps of Don Quixote,"[4] the *Rambles* opens with the author deciding to leave Toledo to seek out the scenes of the Knight's more famous adventures. The pilgrimage allows him to describe typical Spaniards that he met, characteristic inns that he visited, and representative scenes that he observed—the information being lifted almost verbatim from his *Spain in 1830*;[5] it also provides occasions for fond reminiscence about notable events in *Don Quixote* associated with the places visited, and, frequently, for critical comments on the novel.

This marriage of the travel book on Spain and commentary on *Don Quixote* was not without precedent. As early as 1775 Richard Twiss in his *Travels Through Spain and Portugal in 1772 and 1773* interrupted a narrative mainly concerned with *objets d'art* to note while dining at Quintanar in La Mancha that this was the "feigned" birthplace of Don Quixote and that nearby Toboso "gave birth to Dulcinea"; further on some windmills recall the Knight's famed adventure (p. 194). Two years later in 1777, William Dalrymple, in his *Travels Through Spain and Portugal in 1774; with a Short Account of the Spanish Expedition Against Algiers in 1775*, declared that "to read *Don Quixote* with satisfaction, a man must visit this province" (p. 29), and went on to recall various events from the novel as he visited the places with which they were associated. To this reminiscence motif Henry Swinburne in 1779 added another in his *Travels through Spain in the Years 1775 and 1776*, recording first-hand evidence that confirmed Cervantes' details of Spanish life, such as a "little, round, squat figure" who was the very image of Sancho (I, 167),[6] and carts loaded with spears for the bullfights which might well have suggested the episode of Merlin's chariot (II, 268).

Two years afterwards, in 1781, appeared the travel book most notable for developing the motif of *Quixote* criticism in that genre before the *Rambles*, John Talbot Dillon's *Letters from an English Traveller in Spain, in 1778, on the Origin and Progress of Poetry in the Kingdom: with Occasional Reflections on Manners and Customs; and Illustrations of the Romance of "Don Quixote."*[7] The letters—from the author

[4] I (1831), 84-90, 208-216, 328-335, 592-601.

[5] Two vols., London, 1831. Unless otherwise noted, place of publication for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century books is London.

[6] Citations are from the 1787 edition.

[7] Dillon's information on Spanish literature is borrowed mainly from *Orígenes de la poesía castellana* by Velásquez and from Sarmiento and Sedano, according to E. G. Cox, *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel* (Seattle, 1935), I, 152.

to a friend (probably imaginary) from whom he has become separated during his continental tour, but whom he has promised to direct in the study of Spanish literature—are presumably written from different points in Spain. Their subject matter is connected in some way (often a quite awkward one) with the city of origin: the period in which it was famous, an author connected with it, or a literary episode related to it. This very self-conscious work diverted the epistolary travel book to critical purposes and showed a striving for literary style and form while continuing the tradition of pausing at Spanish sites memorable for episodes in *Don Quixote* and finding confirmation of the novel's trueness to Spanish life, as had earlier, less artful travel works. It also made explicit what had been implicit in these earlier works—a high regard for "the incomparable romance" *Don Quixote* and its author, who is the near equal of Shakespeare in his knowledge of the "inmost recesses of the human heart" (p. 229). Dillon's *Letters* marked a culmination and a conclusion of what might be called the reminiscence-reality-reverence theme in travel-book commentary on *Don Quixote* during the eighteenth century, as the Reverend John Bowle's edition of the novel published the same year signalized the culmination of scholarly and critical approbation. Except for rare brief mention, the *Don Quixote* motif then disappeared from travel literature until after the Peninsula War. Incidental allusions in travel books by John Milford in 1815[8] and Michael J. Quin in 1823[9] were followed in 1831 by the return in force of the reminiscence-reality-reverence theme in Arthur Brooke's *Sketches in Spain and Morocco*, Inglis' *Spain in 1830*, and the magazine version of the *Rambles*.

Into the basic travel-book framework Inglis introduced characters and events, ostensibly real but evidently fictional, straight out of the picaresque novels and *Don Quixote* itself. Setting out from Toledo for La Mancha, the author (who becomes a character in the work) in approved picaresque fashion elicits from the Andalusian muleteer his life story, which explains how he became a muleteer and points up certain traits prominent in the Andaluz character (Chap. II). Set down at the La Mancha border, the author enters Miguel Estevan, which he has decided (by reference to Cervantes) must be the Knight's native village (Chap. IV).[10] Here he spies a barber's sign, and, having by now com-

[8] See, e.g., *Peninsular Sketches during a Recent Tour*, p. 124.

[9] See *A Visit to Spain; Detailing the Transactions which Occurred During A Residence in that Country, in Part of 1822, and the First Months of 1823 with General Notices of the Manners, Customs, Costumes and Music of the Country*, pp. 282-286.

[10] Inglis' spelling of Spanish place names is retained throughout. Other con-

pletely entered into the spirit of his quest, approaches the shop with a greeting for Master Nicholas and a query about the health of his neighbors, the curate and the *hidalgo* Don Quixote. The barber, who is named Lázaro, declares himself to be a descendant of Cervantes' Nicholas, and Miguel Estevan to be indeed the home town of the Knight of the Sorrowful Countenance. After showing the Author the village, the barber offers his services as squire, declaring that it is but fitting and proper that anyone following the illustrious Knight have a squire to act as guide. The two set out to visit the sites connected with the various adventures of the Knight (Chap. VI). In the course of their wanderings, the barber relates his own picaresque life history; they meet a reformed bandit Polinario and a one-time *picaro*, Juanes, who tell of their previous history; and they discuss, in Socratic fashion, the meaning and the merits of the *Don Quixote*.

The two pilgrims and their continuing commentary and criticism of *Don Quixote* provide the unifying theme of the *Rambles*. Primarily the book is an affectionate criticism or, more accurately perhaps, appreciation of *Don Quixote*, in harmony with the more serious and admiring critical approach to the novel and its hero which had begun to develop in the eighteenth century and came to full expression in the nineteenth. The romantic conception—first set forth in Hazlitt's commentary in "Standard Novels and Romances" (*Edinburgh Review*, 1815),[11] and maintained with personal variations by such critics as Coleridge, Scott, Lamb, and Lockhart—emphasized the genius of Cervantes (who was frequently ranked next to Shakespeare in imagination), the nobility, high-mindedness, and chivalry of the Knight, and the comprehensive scope, serious purpose, and universality of this "perfect" novel; implicitly if not explicitly, the romantic critics discerned tragic qualities in the book.[12]

Inglis develops his own variations of this basic conception while the two pilgrims mingle critical observations and expressions of pleasure

temporary commentators had their own candidates for Quixote's native village; see, e.g., the *Dublin University Magazine*, II (1838), 576-577, and the *New Monthly Magazine*, NS, XLVIII (1836), 240-241.

[11] *Works*, ed. P. P. Howe (London, 1930-34), XVI, 8-9. See also XI, 263, and XX, 106-107.

[12] Full discussions of the shift in interpretation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries appear in Edwin B. Knowles' "Cervantes and English Literature," in *Cervantes Across the Centuries*, ed. A. Flores and M. J. Benardete (New York, 1947); and especially "*Don Quixote* Through English Eyes," *Hispania*, XXIII (1940), 100-115; Ronald Hilton's briefer "Four Centuries of a Best-Selling Masterpiece," *Hispania*, XXX (1947), 310-320; and my "Scott's Conception of *Don Quixote*," *Midwest Review* (1959), pp. 37-42.

as they follow Quixote's supposed route, happily finding "proof" that this is the place where the Knight met the goatherd or that the place where he mistook the windmills for giants. To some extent, there are differences in the points of view of the two pilgrims. Lázaro the barber is a Cervantes-Quixote enthusiast; in fact, he bears the strong impress of the Knight of La Mancha himself in the single-mindedness of his reiteration of Cervantes' perfection and his frequent implication of the Knight's physical reality. He believes himself a descendant of Master Nicholas, and on one occasion is on the point of declaring that the inn that Quixote mistook for a castle is as real as the Knight himself, but amends his statement under the Author's dubious eye (Chap. X). On another occasion he heatedly dismisses the adventures of the ex-bandit Don José by declaring that they cannot even compare with those "of him whose footsteps we are following" (Chap. XIX). He praises the book's excellence and justifies the Knight's behavior when the Author calls it into question. Lázaro cannot regard the interspersed stories as inappropriate, for they are both interesting and instructive in themselves and useful in preparing for subsequent events in the novel. (Chap. XXVII).

But *Don Quixote* is not only a perfect book; it is also a serious book. In defending this position against the Author's statement that it is one of the funniest books he has read, the barber presents a typical romantic view: the adventures, however admirable they may be, are "only heads of the discourse . . . which, although more striking, are perhaps less valuable than that which intervenes," that is, the conversations between the Knight and his Squire (Chap. XX, pp. 128-129). Even the adventures, however, are not merely humorous; agreeing with the Author that the episode of the Yanguesian carriers was an unlucky one for Quixote and Sancho, Lázaro maintains that "an unlucky adventure illustrates character as well as a more fortunate one. The affection of Sancho for his master, and of both for their dumb beasts, is well exemplified in it . . . and the only difference between the benevolence of the Knight and the Squire is, that the benevolence of the squire is lavished upon his ass, while that of his master spreads itself over the whole human race" (Chap. XV, pp. 89-90). The primarily serious approach to the novel which characterized romantic criticism becomes even more explicit in the remainder of the passage. When the Author remarks that he cannot help regarding the humor as the chief distinction of the book, the barber replies that "few persons" in Spain will agree, adding that, when he reads aloud from his copy, "the audience is large, but no one laughs, though every one admires." And the Author silently concedes the point, noting that a highly educated Spaniard with whom he has

spoken regarded the interest of the book as lying in the contrast between the ignorance and the knowledge exemplified in the two chief characters, a situation in which he found much to induce reflection, but little to provoke laughter (pp. 90-91).

With all the apparent difference in point of view between the barber and the Author, who carefully notes the other's "enthusiastic" opinions and has a little quiet fun about them, the two are in basic agreement in their conception of the novel. The Author declares that none in England was "so powerful in genius," so brilliant in invention, so rich in all that makes a work immortal (Chap. XI, p. 68). Echoing a familiar refrain, he notes that Cervantes wrote because his genius overflowed, not because he primarily wished to ridicule books of knight errantry. And the work is all things to all men:

> The gentleman, the Christian, the master, the servant, may each learn something from its pages; for the Knight of La Mancha was a more perfect gentleman, a better practical Christian, a more excellent master, ay, and a wiser man, too, than probably any of those who study his life and conversation. Cervantes evidently intended to personify the intellectual and the animal parts of our nature, in the contrast between the knight and the squire. High mindedness, loftiness of purpose, unbounded generosity, total disinterestedness, undaunted courage, humility, Christian resignation—these are the attributes of intellectual perfection; while in the character of the squire we find all that is sensual, worldly, common, and vulgar, united with only that rough good sense, blunt honesty, good nature, and kind affection, which are compatible with an uninformed mind, and a low station [Chap. VII, p. 43].

The passage reads like a catalogue of the qualities commonly associated with the Knight in this period, with the general idealization of character spread to encompass Sancho as well. Ultimately the Author is led to acknowledge the courage of the Knight; when Lázaro recalls the fulling-hammer adventure, the author admits that "in no one of the adventures is the intrepid character of the knight" or the kindness of Sancho better displayed, considering the "solitude of the place," the "dreary whisper of the trees," and the battered condition of the Knight as a result of his encounter with the sheep (Chap. XXI, p. 132). The Author, in fact, fights a losing battle with the barber, despite the often gently ironic tone he adopts in recounting the barber's opinions. Perhaps nothing illustrates this better than the Author's acknowledgment that it is not the pleasure of verifying Cervantes' accuracy in depicting Spanish life that primarily occupies the rambler after Don Quixote; the scenes

> serve rather to call to recollection those inimitable dialogues between the Knight and his Squire, in which all that is romantic or extravagant, is opposed to the commonplace maxims of every day life; in which the noble and intellectual, is

placed in ludicrous contrast with contented ignorance and vulgar honesty; and in which the high-flown language of a distempered fancy, is overwhelmed in a cloud of proverbs [Chap. XXVI, p. 186].

The Author's own comments, however, dwell principally on the accuracy of *Don Quixote* in depicting Spanish life. As we have seen, this approach to the novel had its precedents in the travel books; it was also a common theme in the early nineteenth century. The *Gentleman's Magazine* as early as 1818 and the *New Monthly Magazine* as late as 1832 linked Cervantes' novel with *Gil Blas* as a "key to Spanish customs and manners";[13] a reviewer of John Gibson Lockhart's edition of *Don Quixote* agreed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* that one of the great virtues of the novel was "the minute description, nowhere else to be met with, of the habits and manners of the Spanish nation";[14] and, in the preface to his edition of *Don Quixote* in 1822, Lockhart, besides echoing the romantic praise of Cervantes and idealization of the Knight, termed the wit and satire merely accessories to "a picture of national life and manners, by far the most perfect and glowing that was ever embodied in one piece of composition" and one that alone is sufficient to preserve the honorable name and character of the Spanish people.[15]

In the *Rambles*, the Author, at almost every place along the route, finds confirmation of a remark, a detail, a characterization in the novel: the description of the bare, treeless La Mancha countryside and the use of the wineskin (Chap. VII); the lower-class women's habit of wearing a petticoat skirt thrown over their head (Chap. X); the abundance of rosemary (Chap. XII); the portrait of the Asturian servant maid with her "capacious countenance" and rather startling height (Chap. XVI); the primitive accommodations at an inn which is presumably the one Quixote mistook for a castle (Chap. XX). "So faithful are the pictures of Cervantes, that when we find any contradiction between his sketches, and the realities we see around, we feel inclined to inquire into the cause" even as we would do of a travel guide (Chap. XII, p. 73).

Enriching the *Quixote* motif and varying the structure of the book is the picaresque autobiography of Lázaro, one of three such rogue autobiographies in the *Rambles*. The story is related in installments as the barber and the Author relax beneath an olive tree at midday or meet an old friend at a *posada*. The guide-enthusiast tells how he learned of his literary ancestry at Miguel Estevan and how he came to set himself

[13] *GM*, LXXXVIII, pt. 2, 55; *NMM*, NS, XXXVI, 479.

[14] XCII, pt. 2 (1822), 243-244.

[15] *History of the Ingenious Gentleman, Don Quixote of La Mancha. Translated out of the Spanish by Motteux. A New Edition with Copious Notes and an Essay on the Life and Writings of Cervantes* (Edinburgh, 1822), p. lvii.

up as a barber there, all because of his introduction to *Don Quixote*.[16] Lázaro was a barber to a Carthusian monastery, with the duty of shaving the friars once a week; one day when a religious of the most apparent piety suddenly interrupted his shave by a burst of laughter, he could only gasp out that Lázaro could learn the cause by reading the book which he held in his hands—a copy of *Don Quixote*, kept carefully hidden in his breviary. Thus introduced to the novel, Lázaro became an avid member of the *Quixote* cult under the tutelage of the friar, who expounded the thesis that underlies and unifies Inglis' critical view in the *Rambles* (and many other romantic commentaries); the novel is "better than a hundred sermons"—it softens obdurate hearts, converts rogues into honest men, and humbles the proud. When he laughs, the friar explained, it is not at the adventures but at the contrast between the two central figures; the adventures make him sad, "for it is melancholy to see the noble-minded knight always the dupe of his own illusions" (Chap. XXV, p. 176). The barber himself pointedly declares to a rogue friend whom he and the Author meet that it was *Don Quixote* which made an honest man of him. When the French invasion made havoc of the monasteries and convents, Lázaro and the friar set out to follow the footsteps of Quixote; when he learned the secret of his descent from Master Nicholas, that earlier pilgrimage was interrupted, and Lázaro established himself as a barber in the native village which he shared with Don Quixote.

Besides dramatizing themes and paralleling situations in the central narrative and dialogue of the *Rambles*, Lázaro's story utilizes certain situations common in the picaresque tradition, especially in Spain. There is the familiar episode of the servant who steals food and money at night and allows blame to fall on the mice, but is ultimately caught, locked up, and forced to slide all the money under the door in exchange for food (Chaps. VIII, XIV, XXII); and the story of a servant who overhears a compromising conversation involving a clerical master but is discovered when he begins to snicker (Chap. IX). In the *Rambles* the master in every case is a cleric, and the incidents impute selfishness, parsimony, and hypocrisy to Catholic priests in Spain. This is not inappropriate in a commentary on *Don Quixote*, since that novel directs some well-aimed satire against evils in the Church. But it is also a common theme in Inglis' works, both here and in earlier writings. Lázaro and his clerical master collaborate to pawn off on the archbishop a cock's tongue as that of the fowl who had crowed when Peter denied Christ; a self-indulgent priest lives in luxury and splendor while Lázaro

[16] The barber's story occupies parts of Chaps. VIII, IX, XII, XIV, XXII, XXIV, XXV.

and others go hungry (Chap. IX). The picture of the Church as an institution that fostered and permitted ignorance, superstition, and corruption was a common one in the Gothic novels and even in writings of a more respectable nature, such as Shelley's *Epipsychidion.* The evils of the Roman clergy were thought to be especially pronounced in Spain, as witness *The Monk, Melmoth the Wanderer,* or a multitude of less notable Gothic and sentimental tales, such as *Mordaunt* by Sir John Moore (1800) or *Theodosius de Zulvin: The Monk of Madrid* by George Walker (1801).[17]

The anti-Catholic note appears also in the two other interspersed tales in *Rambles,* autobiographies of former rascals who have attained a precarious respectability. Juanes, whom the barber has not seen since childhood, recounts how he once served and bested a gluttonous and licentious friar (Chap. XXIII). Polinario, one of the "banditti" with which Gothic novelists populated Spain and the Pyrenees, tells how he and his gang rescued a fair maiden from a situation that was the delight of the Gothic writers, especially those who set their stories in Spain: she was being forced into a convent by parents and clergy for refusing to marry the man her father had chosen and who was, of course, a blackguard (Chaps. XVII, XIX).

Inglis' *Rambles,* published posthumously under his widow's supervision, is evidently incomplete; the magazine version left the two companions just inside the Sierra Morena and hinted that the author would keep silent about their further travels (I, 601); the 1837 edition leaves the characters in the same situation but adds a few critical remarks about *Don Quixote* and hints of further adventures if these should be well received. But, despite its incompleteness and some mechanical and stylistic blemishes which Inglis did not live to correct,[18] reviewers enchanted by *Don Quixote* and hungry for information about Spanish life welcomed the *Rambles* as "something between a reality and a fiction, and so united as to defy distinction and separation,"[19] combining interesting information about Spain and excellent criticism of the great work of Cervantes.

University of Toledo

[17] Sister Mary M. Tarr, *Catholicism in Gothic Fiction: A Study of the Nature and Function of Catholic Material in Gothic Fiction in England, 1762-1830* (Washington, 1946), considers this matter at length.

[18] Inconsistencies in punctuation and capitalization, stylistic awkwardnesses, and outright confusion of Dorothea with an unidentified character named Lucretia in one of the chapters added for the 1837 edition (Chap. XXVII) suggest that the book was still being corrected and expanded when Inglis died in 1835.

[19] *Gentleman's Magazine,* CLXIII (1838), 175.

KARL F. THOMPSON

A Note on Ariosto's *I Suppositi*

ARIOSTO'S *I Suppositi* (1509) is sometimes cited as early evidence of the tendency toward romance in the drama of the Italian Renaissance. This tendency has also been seen operating in England in Gascoigne's translation (1566) of Ariosto's comedy. It would be pleasant, of course, if literary history could be made so neat; but it seems likely that certain literary historians have seen more here than really exists. For example, H. B. Charlton, in his exposition of the growth of Elizabethan comedy,[1] has cited more examples—quoting Gascoigne's, not Ariosto's words—than are pertinent to prove the existence of romantic tendencies in *I Suppositi*, and has consequently overstated his case.

Charlton's interpretations may be judged by comparing certain passages in Gascoigne's near-translation with Ariosto's lines.[2] If these comparisons reveal certain qualities which in later development characterize the romantic comedy, we can agree with Charlton. Such qualities are, for

[1] *Shakespearian Comedy* (London, 1949), pp. 78-81.

[2] R. W. Bond, *Early Plays from the Italian* (Oxford, 1911), prints the text of *Supposes* from Q_2 (1575). *Supposes* is included in the early quarto editions of Gascoigne's works: *A hundreth sundrie Flowres bounde vp in one small Posie* (1572-73), *The Posies of George Gascoine Esquire* (1575), and *The Whole woorkes of George Gascoigne Esquyre* (1587). Quotations of *I Suppositi* are from Ludovico Ariosto, *Opere minori*, ed. Cesare Segrè (Milan, 1954), pp. 297-349, a text based on the edition of 1524. It is generally agreed that *I Suppositi* was first acted at Ferrara in 1509 and then in the Vatican in 1519. The first dated edition of the prose form is Siena, 1523. A prose edition also appeared in Rome in 1524, which indicates that the Vatican performance was probably of the prose version. The first verse edition is that printed by Giolito de Ferrari at Venice ("Riformata & ridotta in versi"), 1551. Some bibliographers (and Bond, p. li) say that the 1542 Bindoni imprint is the first verse edition, but Michele Catalano, Ludovico Ariosto, *Le commedie* (Bologna, 1940), I, xxxiii, is correct in describing this as a prose edition.

example, a sympathetic attitude toward the heroine resulting in the depiction of a modest, morally resolute maiden, and a more generous view of the conventional types than is evident in Roman comedy. Moreover, if there is a tendency toward romantic comedy in the Italian play, we may be sure that Gascoigne will be susceptible to it; for he is less bound by the dramatic conventions of the Roman comedy than Ariosto, who acknowledged his debt to Terence's *Eunuchus* and Plautus' *Captivi*.

One of the scenes in Ariosto's version where fidelity to or changes from dramatic conventions would be evident is the discovery of the secret amour between Polinesta, daughter of the wealthy Damone, and the supposed servant Dulippo (really the young and wealthy Erastrato disguised). Here the playwright exploits all of the sensational possibilities of the action. First, Psiteria, the *ancilla* of Ariosto's play, tells of Polinesta's grief and of the general uproar within doors. Surprisingly, or so Charlton finds (p. 79)—for words like pity and sympathy from a creature like her are unexpected—Ariosto has her describe Polinesta's concern not for herself but for the nurse and young Erastrato:

> Mi duole de quella misera fanciulla che piange e si straccia i capelli, e si dibatte, che gli è gran compassione a vederla; non perché il patre l'abbia battuta né minacciata, anzi il doloroso vecchio ha pianto con lei: ma per pietà che ella ha de la sua nutrice, e più, sanza paragone, di Dulippo, che amendua sono per fare male li fatti loro [III, iii].

True Plautine characters are not notably sympathetic with the unfortunate participants in such intrigues; they enjoy the to-do that follows discovery. Is this passage, though, really a step away from the hardness of the Latin comedy? Perhaps—if it is acted so, with Psiteria enunciating her lines with a tone of sympathy rather than with malice as she tells of the discomfiture of her old enemy the nurse. Gascoigne, however, does make an unmistakable change. In his version (III, lines 30-34) Psiteria does not mention the nurse's mischance and speaks only of Polinesta's grief and her father's tears. Gascoigne's scene, in minimizing the contention of the agents of the intrigue, is indeed different from the classic tradition. By comparison, Ariosto's version seems a very minor change from the Plautine mode, if indeed it is a change at all. But Charlton, quoting Gascoigne not Ariosto, is willing to find in the Italian play a noteworthy shift in tone.

Similarly, Gascoigne's changes in the comments made by the parasite Pasifilo on the discovery of the young lovers make Ariosto's version seem quite conventional. Here is Ariosto's character soliloquizing:

> Che averia de lei così creduto? Dimanda, alla vicinanza di sua condizione: la migliore, la più devota giovane del mondo; non practica mai se non con suore; la

più parte del dì sta in orazione; rarissime volte si vede o a uscio o a finestra; non si ode che d'alcuno innamorata sia: è una santarella. Buon pro le faccia! Colui che l'averà per moglie, guadagnerà più dote che non si pensa: un paio almeno, se non più, di lunghissime corna mancar non gli possono [III, iii].

Although Gascoigne apparently restates Pasiphilo's amazement in the same tone employed by Ariosto's character, there is a change. Believing that Polynesta's lover is merely a servant, Pasiphilo turns a malicious phrase about the dowry her official suitor, the rich Cleander, will receive with her: "He'll lack no corne in a dear year." This use of an expression that sounds like a proverb or folk saying is at once an example of the domestication of a foreign play and the modernization, as it were, of a conventional style. The Italian version does not have the folk humor, but relies on the well-worn jest about horns. Gascoigne's use of "corne" as if it were suggested by the Italian *corna* seems a desperate bilingual pun. Ariosto's phrase is clever but artificial, while Gascoigne's countrified expression makes his play seem more "real," closer to the real speech of his audience at any rate.

Nor is Pasifilo's description of Polinesta in Ariosto's play a clear harbinger of the heroine of romantic comedy, as Charlton would have it (p. 79). True, Ariosto has his Pasifilo describe Polinesta in terms that give a more pleasant picture of a young woman than occurs in Roman comedy. She has enjoyed the reputation, not of the Plautine *meretrix*, but that of a model young lady, a devout, modest maiden. This is, perhaps, Polinesta's true character, although this supposition is rendered difficult when she blames the nurse, not herself, for her having yielded to Erastrato. She shows little inclination at the beginning of the play to do other than continue the clandestine affair. The point is that Ariosto's Pasifilo expresses not praise of Polinesta but amazement at her skillful duping of the whole neighborhood with her pretended virtue and piety.

Another example, one that Charlton (p. 80) makes much of, is the father's (Damone) sorrow and self-reproach for his daughter's disgrace:

Quando di questo tristo avessi fatto tutti li strazi che sieno possibile, non potrò far però che mia figliuola violata et io disonorato in perpetuo non sia. Ma di chi voglio io fare strazio? Io, io solo son quello che merito d'essere punito, che me ho fidato lasciarla in guardia di questa puttana vecchia. Se io volevo che fussi bene custodita, la dovevo custodire io, farla dormire ne la camera mio, non tenere famigli giovani, non le fare un buon viso mai. O cara moglie mia, adesso connosco la iattura che io feci, quando di te rimasi privo! [III, iii].

This can be interpreted, perhaps, as the utterance of a more sympathetic character than the *senex* of Latin comedy. Not only is Damone

enraged at his daughter's seduction, but, in a more modern way appropriate to romantic comedy, heartbroken as he thinks of his own dead wife. But it can also be read as the utterance of a father who regrets that he did not apply the rod earlier and was not more carefully severe. Damone is more the tyrannical father who sees his mistake too late than he is the heartbroken old man. Even his lament for his wife is colored by his regret at having lost in her a good guardian over their daughter. He sounds, indeed, much like Brabantio in *Othello*, who thinks that from our children's errors we should learn "tyranny, to hang clogs on 'em." When Gascoigne translates this scene, however, we have, I believe, a genuine hint of romantic comedy. In the first place, he has Damone call the nurse a "careless creature," a milder term indeed than Ariosto's "questa puttana vecchia." He also elaborates Damone's grief for his wife:

> O wife, my good wife (that nowe lyest colde in the graue) now may I well bewayle the wante of thee, and mourning nowe may I bemone that I misse thee: if thou hadst liued (suche was thy gouernement of the least things) that thou wouldest prudently haue prouided for the preseruation of this pearle [III, iii, 41-46].

Gascoigne's Damone sounds truly sorrowful, whereas Ariosto's simply expresses regret at not having an efficient supervisor of his daughter, thus saving himself time and worry in her upbringing. Gascoigne here departs even farther from his source and goes on to moralize on the ingratitude of children and on the duties of parents. He soon loses the romantic or sentimental tone in his anxiety lest he miss an opportunty for lecturing on one of his favorite subjects.

The other old person in this play is similarly treated—sympathetically by Gascoigne, less so by Ariosto. Gascoigne has the errant Erastrato's father say of him:

> At the last he came hither, I thinke he was scarce here so sone as I felt the want of him, in such sorte, as from that day to this I haue passed fewe nightes withoute tears... I would not be without the sighte of hym againe so long, for all the learning in the worlde [IV, iii].

This is different in tone from Ariosto's lines in which Filogono, Erastrato's father, says:

> Non credo che di fussi ancora giunto, che me ne cominciò a dolere tanto, che da quell'ora sino a questa non sono mai stato di buona voglia... tuttavia non mi curo che sia di tanta dottrina, dovendo stare per questo molti anni da lui disgiunto [IV, iii].

Even to unskilled ears there is a difference between the emotionally affecting "passed fewe nightes without teares" and "di buona voglia," which is like saying "di buon umore."

It has been helpful to compare Gascoigne and Ariosto even briefly, for we can see that there are few, if any, definite changes in the direction of romantic comedy in the Italian play. When the play is "Englished by George Gascoygne of Grayes Inne," however, it is rendered markedly different in tone and effect. In Ariosto's play the characters remain much the same as the conventional types of Roman comedy despite the contemporaneity of costume and locale. What is remarkable about *I Suppositi*, it seems to me, is that it is so true to the Latin model. Ariosto of all people might have been expected to incorporate his romantic notions, so evident in the *Orlando*, into his comedies. He apparently preferred to keep the literary genres separate.

The moral of all this is that one can never safely quote an English translation of an Italian work to prove something about the Italian. This is, unfortunately, what Charlton did, with the result that his examples impart meanings and intonations that are not in Ariosto's play. The Italian Renaissance, generally speaking, remained truer to the ancient forms, retaining the old literary traditions in greater purity, than did the English Renaissance. We need to be reminded of this from time to time: and a review of the differences between *I Suppositi* and *Supposes* is an admirably suited reminder.

Michigan State University

MELVIN J. FRIEDMAN

The Novels of Samuel Beckett: An Amalgam Of Joyce and Proust

SAMUEL BECKETT has said little directly about his own work. He has modestly avoided taking a literary stand or connecting himself with any "school" or movement. But this has not prevented his commentators from associating his plays with those of Adamov and Ionesco, and his novels with those of Kafka, Camus, and Genet. Denied the assent of Beckett, who has so far remained noncommittal concerning his literary forebears, most of these judgments must be relegated to the category of impressionistic criticism.

On two occasions, however, Beckett has made known his opinions of other writers. In 1929 he contributed a twenty-page essay to a volume published in James Joyce's honor, *Our Exagmination round his Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress.* Two years later he published a monograph on Marcel Proust.

The Joyce essay, bearing the tangential yet suggestive title "Dante . . . Bruno . Vico . . Joyce," is clearly the work of a young man. It is original and intuitive but at the same time digressive and facile. Comparison with Joyce's early critical article on Ibsen immediately comes to mind. Beckett shows the same blind dedication to Joyce which Joyce showed to Ibsen twenty-nine years earlier.[1] The youthful pretentiousness of Beckett's title is carried over into the essay:

> And now here am I, with my handful of abstractions, among which notably: a mountain, the coincidence of contraries, the inevitability of cyclic evolution, a

[1] "Ibsen's New Drama," *Fortnightly Review,* LXXIII (1900), 575-590.

system of Poetics, and the prospect of self-extension in the world of Mr. Joyce's *'Work in Progress'* [*Our Exagmination*, Paris, 1929, p. 3].

Indeed the task of recor iling Joyce with the three distinguished Italians with whom Beckett connects him in his title is of herculean proportions. Beckett gets swallowed up in the enthusiasm of his own words and pronouncements. He becomes Joyce's self-appointed champion and cries out against the philistines who have declared the Irish writer too oblique.

On turning to the *'Work in Progress'* we find that the mirror is not so convex. Here is direct expression—pages and pages of it. And if you don't understand it, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is because you are too decadent to receive it [p. 13].

Then Beckett breaks into a series of generalizations which set the tone for the remainder of the essay. Such catch phrases as "Here form *is* content, content *is* form" (p. 14), "His writing is not *about* something; *it is that something itself*" (p. 14), "Mr. Joyce has desophisticated language" (p. 15), "a quintessential extraction of language and painting and gesture" (p. 15), set the characteristic pace of the disciple speaking in abstract superlatives about his master.

Most of these comments have a surface brilliance but in the end are probably no more than a clever word game, and cannot really help us find the seeds of Beckett's novels in his early literary criticism. However, he does let slip one crucial observation.

There is one point to make clear: the Beauty of *'Work in Progress'* is not presented in space alone, since its adequate apprehension depends as much on its visibility as on its audibility. There is a temporal as well as a spatial unity to be apprehended [p. 15].

The space-time, audio-visual connections which are essential to Joyce's work are also present in the novels of his young enthusiast, as will be seen.

Beckett maintained his interest in Joyce's work. He was very helpful with the French translation of the Anna Livia Plurabelle section of *Work in Progress*, published in 1931 in the *Nouvelle Revue Française*. These were the years when Beckett served as "lecteur d'Anglais" at the École Normale Supérieure. He was already seriously considering the step of expatriation which Joyce had taken; he was on the verge of rejecting his native Ireland and seeking permanent refuge in Paris—which he did finally in 1937.

The connection with Joyce takes on a more personal aspect at this time. Peggy Guggenheim, Richard Ellmann, and others report how Beckett served as Joyce's secretary and came very close to marrying his daughter. The memoirs of Peggy Guggenheim, *Out of This Century*,

are especially revealing. The frequently married heiress had a strong personal attachment for Beckett, which often exceeded the bounds of propriety, and she was naturally anxious to hold his interest. She tells us that in a strange, almost unnatural, way her chief rival for his attentions was James Joyce. (There is certainly no hint of homosexuality, merely a dispossessed son searching for a father, the Stephen Dedalus-Leopold Bloom situation all over again.)[2] It is interesting to have this report, which reaffirms Beckett's early literary gestures in Joyce's behalf. The relationship almost had to be one-sided; the author of a few scattered poems and a volume of short stories[3] was clearly overshadowed by the author of *Ulysses* and of what was to become two years later *Finnegans Wake*.

His hero worship of Joyce the man as well as of Joyce the writer is a very different thing from Beckett's admiration of Proust. There is no puppy-dog servility in the monograph on Proust which appeared in 1931. Beckett now wrote with genuine detachment, since he had no personal ties with the French writer, who had died nine years earlier.

Still, this step in the Gallicizing of Beckett takes a curious twist—rather like entering through a forbidden back staircase, an approach which has always tempted him. Proust is hardly the writer to turn to if one is looking for a typically French model. His style has been traditionally considered un-French; when *A la recherche du temps perdu* was turned into English by C. K. Scott Moncrieff, the result was so genuine that several critics suggested that Proust had missed his literary vocation by writing in French.

There is certainly more critical maturity in *Proust* than in "Dante . . . Bruno . Vico . . Joyce." Some of the most interesting passages have to do with style. Beckett insists that "for Proust, as for the painter, style is more a question of vision than of technique."[4] One is reminded of the

[2] Peggy Guggenheim describes a year-long love affair with Beckett, whom she fondly calls Oblomov (his indolence seems to have reminded her of Goncharov's hero). "In spite of the fact that I took every consolation which crossed my path, I was entirely obsessed for over a year by the strange creature whom I shall call Oblomov. He came into my life the day after Christmas, 1937. I had known him slightly. He had been to our house in the Avenue Reille. I knew that he was a friend of James Joyce, that he had been engaged to his daughter and had caused her great unhappiness." On the following page she writes that "Oblomov was a sort of slave to Joyce." *Out of This Century* (New York, 1946), pp. 194, 195.

[3] The best known of Beckett's works up to this time were the long poem, *Whoroscope* (1930), the collection of short stories, *More Pricks than Kicks* (1934), and the poems contained in *Echo's Bones* (1936).

[4] *Proust*, p. 67. Proust makes a similar remark in one of his letters: "Le style n'est nullement un enjolivement, comme croient certaines personnes, ce n'est même pas une question de technique, c'est comme la couleur chez les peintres, une qualité de vision . . ." *Lettres de Marcel Proust à Bibesco* (Lausanne, 1949), p. 177.

extraordinary powers which Proust attributes to the visual arts—the magical properties which Marcel finds in Elstir's art and the strange fascination which draws Bergotte to his beloved Vermeer painting just before his death. Beckett saw that Proust's style has a more than ordinary concentration of metaphor, a less than ordinary concern with the well-turned phrase or the technically perfect sentence.

> The Proustian world is expressed metaphorically by the artisan because it is apprehended metaphorically by the artist: the indirect and comparative expression of indirect and comparative perception. The rhetorical equivalent of the Proustian real is the chain-figure of the metaphor [*Proust*, pp. 67-68].

He goes on to describe the type of image which predominates in Proust and makes the interesting, if not startling, observation:

> It is significant that the majority of his images are botanical. He assimilates the human to the vegetal. He is conscious of humanity as flora, never as fauna. (There are no black cats and faithful hounds in Proust) [p. 68].

With the long tradition in French literature, especially in poetry, which favors animals—Baudelaire's and Verlaine's cat fixation—this is a departure worth noting.

In one way or another Beckett manages to connect everything in Proust's work with the psycho-literary device of involuntary memory.

> Involuntary memory is explosive, 'an immediate, total and delicious deflagration.' It restores, not merely the past object, but the Lazarus that it charmed or tortured ... But involuntary memory is an unruly magician and will not be importuned. It chooses its own time and place for the performance of its miracle [pp. 20-21].

"The chain-figure of the metaphor," the "visionary" aspects of the work, both contribute to these special moments when Proust's characters seem to resist successfully the dulling effects of the exterior world. As several critics have suggested, chance encounters with such diverse and unrelated objects as a madeleine, unevenly spaced flagstones, silverware, and a sonata produce this liberating effect—detachment from time.

But Beckett not only approaches Proust's work through the purely literary and psychological dimensions, but also has something to say about the moral. "Here, as always, Proust is completely detached from all moral considerations. There is no right and wrong in Proust nor in his world" (p. 49). This aspect of Beckett's discussion ends with a general statement which might be applied as readily to Greek and existentialist heroes as to Proust's creatures: "The tragic figure represents the expiation of original sin, of the original and eternal sin of him and all his 'soci malorum,' the sin of having been born" (p. 49).

When we reread the 1929 discussion of Joyce and the 1931 mono-

graph of Proust in the light of the novels Beckett wrote later, we make the important discovery that he was perhaps writing as much about what he himself would become as a novelist as about the Irish or the French novelist. It has become almost a commonplace that the creative writer, writing literary criticism, speaks more of his own work than of that of the author he is studying. Gide made new discoveries about himself when he wrote his monograph on Dostoevsky; Mann fashioned a new Olympian man of himself when he wrote on Goethe. Beckett seems to gain both creative vigor and a literary direction from Joyce and Proust. His novels become a kind of meeting ground for the two most original novelists of the twentieth century.

Beckett's first novel, *Murphy* (1938), is curiously unexperimental when one recalls his literary baptism. It is a third-person narrative, written in English, describing the comic antics of an Irishman in London who finally dies in an insane asylum—where he is not an inmate. Murphy is a kind of Leopold Bloom in reverse—he meets disaster by fleeing from women, and is completely free from the long introspective silences of Joyce's hero. But the Irish wit which is so plentiful in Joyce overflows into Beckett's work. Beckett seems unable to resist the temptation of the comic interlude even when it is quite irrelevant to his novel; he has the Irish gift for delineating character in its most amusing dimensions. Witness this description of a quite secondary character in *Murphy*:

> Cooper experienced none of the famous difficulty in serving two employers. He neither clave nor despised. A lesser man would have sided with one or the other, a bigger blackmailed both. But Cooper was the perfect size for the servant so long as he kept off the bottle and he moved incorruptible between his corruptors with the beautiful indifference of a shuttle, without infamy and without praise. To each he made a full and frank report, ignoring the emendations of the other; and made it first to whichever of the two was more convenient to the point at which dusk surprised him [*Murphy*, pp. 197-198].

The odyssey motif is revived once again in *Murphy*. Murphy is intent on eluding several former mistresses and confidants and gives them a merry chase. His principal pursuers, Miss Counihan and Celia (mistresses) and Wylie and Neary (dubious confidants), follow the almost clueless path to an insane asylum, only to find a dead Murphy. In a characteristically amusing passage, quite irrelevant to the progress of the "action," Beckett describes the bedroom arrangement of the two ladies on the lower floor, the two men above them:

> Miss Counihan would not have minded going up to Wylie if Celia had not minded Neary coming down to her. Nor would Wylie have objected in the least to going down to Celia if Miss Counihan had not objected most strongly to

going up to Neary. Nor would Neary have been less than delighted to go down to either, or have either come up to him, if both had not been more than averse to his attentions, whether on the first floor or the second [p. 255].

This mock-logical arrangement, seemingly exhausting all the possibilities of a given situation, is carried over into *Watt*. This novel, also written in English, seems to be an inexhaustible catalogue of possibilities relevant to a sustained period during which Watt was in the employ of a certain Knott. The first floor-second floor interplay in *Murphy* becomes one of the vital issues of this novel. It is a sign of election in the Knott household for a servant to be shifted from the first to the second floor, but it is also, paradoxically enough, a sign that his services will soon be dispensed with. Watt, like all his predecessors, began on the first floor, was transferred to the second after a year, and was dismissed soon afterwards. And this is all the plot that *Watt* sustains. The novel is marred by such unfortunate word plays as "Not that Watt was ever to have any direct dealings with Mr. Knott, for he was not."[5]

The cataloguing device reaches new levels of absurdity in *Watt*. As Joyce describes everything in Bloom's, Molly's, or Stephen's line of vision, often in overelaborate detail, so Beckett supplies us with an exhaustive list of several generations of a family, with a full analysis of the physical peculiarities of each member, and with a detailed catalogue of word inversions executed by Watt, involving the reversal of letters in the words, of words in the sentences, and of sentences in the paragraphs. Even Leopold Bloom's mind is never subjected to the type of scrutiny which we find in a characteristic passage such as the following:

And to those who objected that neither Ann's charms, nor her powers of persuasion, could be compared with Bridie's, or with a bottle of stout's, it was replied that if Tom had not done this thing in a fit of depression, or in a fit of exaltation, then he had done it in the interval between a fit of depression and a fit of exaltation, or in the interval between a fit of exaltation and a fit of depression, or in the interval between a fit of exaltation and another fit of exaltation, for with Tom depression and exaltation were not of regular alternance, whatever may have been said to the contrary, but often he emerged from one fit of depression only to be seized soon after by another, and frequently he shook off one fit of exaltation only to fall into the next almost at once, and in these brief intervals Tom would sometimes behave most strangely, almost like a man who did not know what he was doing [*Watt*, pp. 118-119].

Watt carries the plotless novel to new lengths; unfortunately, it seems to be a stopping place; it indicates no "new directions" in the novel form. Beckett finished the novel in 1944, though it was not pub-

[5] *Watt* (Paris, 1958), p. 73.

lished until 1953. About this time in his career he made two radical departures from his accustomed manner. One is that all his fiction after the completion of *Watt* is written in French. The other is that he now changes over from the influence of Irish wit, with Joyce as his model, to a more sober, introspective type of novel, closer to Proust.

These classifications, however neat and convincing, are only relative. First of all, another side of Joyce will keep reappearing alongside of Proust in the novels written in French. Second, the new type of hero who appears in these recent Beckett novels is really a carry-over from Watt—the man who suffers from acute physical deficiencies, with "the more intimate senses greatly below par."[6]

But it can still be said that the trilogy in French, *Molloy, Malone Meurt,* and *L'Innommable,*[7] published between 1951 and 1953, reveals a very different Beckett. It is almost as if a change in language effected a change in literary personality. The trilogy proceeds almost as an unbroken monologue—quite in contrast to the objective narrative approach of his first two novels. The omniscient author has fulfilled Joyce's intention, first proposed in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,* of being refined out of existence. Beckett leaves everything up to a series of monologuists who, with one exception, seem to speak in a single voice.

The exception is Moran, who narrates the second part of *Molloy.* He is far more conscious of what he is saying than the other "centers of consciousness" of Beckett's trilogy.[8] Moran begins his section very concretely: "It is midnight. The rain is beating on the windows. I am calm" (*Molloy,* New York, 1955, p. 125). This desire to identify one's location, the preoccupation with space-time considerations, beg comparison with the first words pronounced by Proust's narrator. Marcel has the same fear of not being able to establish his identity, particularly in a temporal sense. "There is a temporal as well as a spatial unity to be apprehended," as Beckett wrote in the 1929 essay on Joyce.

Despite the failure of the other monologuists of Beckett's trilogy to apprehend reality as concretely as Moran, they are still all of a kind. The soliloquies of the trilogy are the thoughts and words of thoroughly desperate men. All have serious physical defects—they are lame, deaf, dumb, blind, or suffer from a combination of these ailments. Proust's

[6] *Watt,* p. 223.

[7] Beckett himself translated these novels into English as *Molloy, Malone Dies,* and *The Unnamable*—collaborating with Patrick Bowles on *Molloy.* Beckett's developed bilingual tendencies serve him in good stead as a translator of his own work, a somewhat unique literary phenomenon.

[8] Molloy narrates the first half of *Molloy*; Malone tells all of *Malone Dies*; the narrator of *The Unnamable,* appropriately enough, goes unnamed.

neurasthenic narrator is better off than Beckett's succession of cripples, though he suffers an occasional failure of lucidity, as attested by the opaque, digressive opening pages of *A la recherche du temps perdu.*

This type of "sickness" in Proust gives the narrator a heightened awareness of the things about him. Everything is expressed through complex interrelationships which result in what Beckett labeled "the chain-figure of the metaphor" in his monograph on Proust. Beckett's characters, on the other hand, although they grope in this poetic direction, depend finally on what they can immediately perceive. They often go through elaborate rituals of identification of the various objects in their line of vision or touch. The dying Malone is intent upon identifying things about him, things which to the ordinary person appear inconsequential but to him have a strange kind of importance. The stub of pencil which keeps eluding him exerts this kind of special, almost plastic appeal: "What a misfortune, the pencil must have slipped from my fingers, for I have only just succeeded in recovering it after forty-eight hours (see above) of intermittent efforts" (*Malone Dies*, New York, 1956, p. 48). This is not peculiar to Malone; the narrators of the other parts of the trilogy have fixations with curious objects. Molloy, for example, has a series of "sucking stones" which preoccupy a good many of his waking hours. Perhaps this fascination with "things" is in some way connected with the physical deficiencies of Beckett's characters.[9] For them the act of seeing, feeling, and touching perfectly routine objects is as creative as the more imaginative, intuitive responses of the ordinary person.

The irresistible urge to identify everything as it becomes apparent to the senses is, then, at the heart of Beckett's aesthetic. Malone's search for the pencil stub is the same kind of experience as Swann's interest in Vinteuil's "petite phrase," only Malone's investigation is conducted on a more primitive level. Both experiences are concerned with the dimension of time which Proust has linked with "involuntary memory." Proust's characters, as has often been noted, seem to resist successfully the dulling effects of the outside world through these chance encounters with unrelated "things"—these objects seem to have magical properties and exert special effects on his creatures.

For Beckett, however, involuntary memory is not the traumatic thing that it was for Proust. Beckett's characters never feel that they can systematically rid themselves of the destructive effects of time, though they are staunch supporters of the creative aspect of memory. They attach themselves to objects, in much the same way that Stephen

[9] See J. Robert Loy, "'Things' in Recent French Literature," *PMLA*, LXXI (1956), 27-41.

Dedalus carries an ashplant and Leopold Bloom holds on to his shriveled potato, because they feel the urge to attach themselves to "things." It is obvious, then, that Beckett's Molloy, Moran, and Malone have reached a level of existence several notches below that of Proust's Marcel, Bergotte, and Elstir. Beckett's characters lack the temperament for imagining that it is possible to escape reality through an artistic experience, through an "involuntary memory"; they are just existentialist enough to believe that there is no way out.

This existentialist type has become increasingly more unfashionable, to the point where Camus recently modified his "l'homme absurde" in favor of "l'homme révolté." Yet Beckett tenaciously holds on to "l'homme absurde" and even exaggerates his disproportion with society; he is guilty of what Beckett refers to in the Proust monograph as "the sin of having been born."

This delight in reviving the outmoded turns up in quite another way in the trilogy. The sustained reproduction of continuous, almost unbroken thoughts through three volumes places *Molloy, Malone Dies,* and *The Unnamable* in the same fictional category as *A la recherche du temps perdu* and *Ulysses.* Only, as Kenneth Allsop was quick to point out, Beckett came rather too late on the introspective scene:

> He is not, in France where he has lived and been known about for years, thought of as being a particularly "daring" experimental writer. His harsh, desolate, denuded style is entirely and unmistakably his own, but his literary "form," the stream-of-consciousness device which most young British writers wouldn't dream of using nowadays for fear of being thought quaint, derives from his years as secretary to James Joyce [*The Angry Decade,* New York, 1958, p. 38].

It took several decades before the stream-of-consciousness form of fiction became an essential part of Beckett's technique, when, if we are to believe Kenneth Allsop and other critics, it was already moribund. Yet the results testify to a convincing "posthumous" application of a technique which was supposed to have been exhausted with the publication of *Finnegans Wake* in 1939.

It is perhaps appropriate in any case for Beckett to use an outmoded technique in his trilogy, since his characters seem to survive through the memory of past achievement; they linger on in a world which ungratefully ignores their existence. Using very recent terminology, we might call these creatures "picaresque saints."[10] Molloy, Malone, and the un-

[10] Patrick Bowles uses the expression "psychological picaresque" in reference to *Molloy* (see "How Samuel Beckett Sees the Universe," *The Listener,* June 19, 1958, p. 1011). Yet R. W. B. Lewis' expression, which he does not use in connection with Beckett, strikes me as a more appropriate term.

named narrator of *The Unnamable* are all engaged in some sort of quest. Molloy fruitlessly searches for his mother whom he is destined never to find; Moran has no idea why he must find Molloy, although he continues to search for him;[11] Malone is not sure why he is confined to a bed and knows relatively little about his surroundings; the unnamed narrator is not certain of his name or whether he is alive or dead, but is intent on making some form of self-discovery. They are all constant wanderers—even if the wandering never quite gets beyond the mind with Malone and the unnamable. The "saint" and the "outlaw," as R. W. B. Lewis has written in another connection, seem to combine to form those people who deny themselves worldly goods because they are only on the fringes of society.

A part of the unnamable's soliloquy has the distinctly "d'outre-tombe" quality of vagueness and uncertainty which pervades the entire trilogy.

> It's of me now I must speak, even if I have to do it with their language, it will be a start, a step towards silence and the end of madness, the madness of having to speak and not being able to, except of things that don't concern me, that don't count, that I don't believe, that they have crammed me full of to prevent me from saying who I am, where I am, and from doing what I have to do in the only way that can put an end to it, from doing what I have to do. [*The Unnamable*, New York, 1958, p. 51].

Even the existentialist hero seems to have more purpose and design than this person. Yet this groping towards a new way of expressing himself indicates a kind of awareness which we have long associated with the symbolist poets and with Proust and Joyce. In the two "lettres du Voyant" and elsewhere, Rimbaud roundly refuses "to do it with their language." Proust's long novel and *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* are even more convincing protests; *Finnegans Wake* especially, Beckett would agree, is an important "step towards silence."[12]

A passage such as that quoted above from *The Unnamable* seems to carry to fruition many of the remarks Beckett had made earlier in reference to Joyce and Proust. "Dante . . . Bruno . Vico . . Joyce" and *Proust* stand almost in the relationship of program notes to the finished piece, the *Molloy-Malone Dies-Unnamable* trilogy.

---

[11] See Warren Lee, "The Bitter Pill of Samuel Beckett," *Chicago Review*, X (1957), 77-87.

[12] All of the important commentators on Joyce, Stuart Gilbert and Harry Levin being probably the most penetrating, mention this aspect of his work. Jean-Jacques Mayoux in his "Le Théâtre de Samuel Beckett," *Études Anglaises*, X (1957) 366, makes the important point: "Comme Joyce, Beckett est un chercheur d'absolu; d'être dans un monde contingent, voué au contingent jusque dans la création imaginative, l'exaspère."

Beckett's most recent work, *Nouvelles et Textes pour rien*,[13] has the same ring of despair we have come to expect from his fiction written in French. The title conveys the listless quality of the prose and the sense of aimlessness. At one point (p. 40) the narrator writes: "Je ne sais pas pourquoi j'ai raconté cette histoire. J'aurais pu tout aussi bien en raconter une autre. Peut-être qu'une autre fois je pourrai en raconter une autre. Ames vives, vous verrez que cela se ressemble." The person speaking seems to lack the vigor of Beckett's other narrators. He has less curiosity about himself and his whereabouts. *Nouvelles et Textes pour rien* is somewhat of a disappointment after the trilogy; its fragmentary structure, put together like a series of fugitive pieces, leaves the reader with a sense of incompleteness.

Because Samuel Beckett came to the fictional marketplace relatively late, we can be fairly certain that he has not yet burned himself out,[14] though Kenneth Allsop's claim "that he is in his technique an obsolete writer"[15] probably has to stand for the time being at least. He still seems to be in the uncomfortable position of the imitator looking frantically for a way of escape.

On the one hand, Beckett is indebted to Proust for his narrative point of view. His characters seem to have the sense of time which Proust found in Bergson and transformed into literary terms. The ability to "recapture" certain moments of their past, though in a far less convincing way than Proust's narrator, saves such lost souls as Molloy and Malone from total extinction of consciousness. The ritual of self-identification which each of Beckett's monologuists goes through is all part of a complicated memory pattern which makes the confused reality about them more meaningful. The sickness of Proust's narrator gives him a more artistic way of looking at the world, while illness among Beckett's characters seems to dull their sensibilities. Proust's imagination sustains an unbridled flow of metaphor, while the less conscious narrators in Beckett are barely articulate. But the search for identity through successive flirtations with "pure time" is carried on in the work of both authors. It is perfectly realized in *A la recherche du temps perdu*, bitterly and disappointingly unrealized in the Molloy trilogy.

On the other hand, Beckett seems indebted to Joyce for his concen-

[13] Paris, 1958. Parts of the work had appeared in various forms earlier.

[14] In 1959 his talents took a new turn, when he translated a large number of Mexican poems—beginning with a sixteenth-century sonnet and ending with a 1910 lyric—into English for inclusion in *An Anthology of Mexican Poetry* (with the critical blessing of a preface by C. M. Bowra). We cannot be sure what new literary feat Beckett will perform next.

[15] *The Angry Decade*, p. 37.

tration on "things."[16] In *Murphy* and *Watt* the concern with the purely physical is handled comically; in the novels written in French the preoccupation becomes a more serious matter. Murphy's rocking-chair exercises, which are so elaborately explained at the beginning of the novel, are not very different from Molloy's bicycle jaunt, except that the latter is treated quite seriously. Joyce had the gift, particularly in *Ulysses*, of making a situation appear both tragic and comic at the same time. Beckett, when he abandoned his native English for his adopted language, seems to have rejected his Irish wit in favor of a more sober, introspective approach. But Dedalus' ashplant and Bloom's potato, both in their comic and tragic dimensions, are echoed in Molloy's "sucking stones" and Malone's pencil stub. This holding on to objects, for Beckett's characters as for Joyce's, is a way of survival.

Joyce's work is filled with a sharp concentration on "things." Ulysses is on occasions a catalogue of the physical properties of the city of Dublin. Joyce cleverly places these bits of Dubliniana in the midst of Bloom monologues. This technique, as has been pointed out before, divides the concentration between Bloom's mind and the city surrounding him. Malone's inmost thoughts are interrupted by a haunting awareness of the objects about him; he repeatedly catalogues the objects in his possession. Beckett seems to have learned from Joyce a method for artistically blending the inmost thoughts of his characters with their exterior surroundings. To Proust's gift of temporal awareness has been added Joyce's gift of spatial awareness.

University of Maryland

[16] William York Tindall touches on this rapprochement between Beckett and Joyce in his excellent article, "Beckett's Bums," *Critique*, II, 1958. He perceptively remarks "that Beckett's trilogy, in one sense, is a kind of portrait of the artist—as an old man; and that *Molloy* is a parody of *Ulysses*" (p. 10). Kenneth Hamilton also touches on the problem in "Boon or Thorn? Joyce Cary and Samuel Beckett on Human Life," *Dalhousie Review*, XXXVIII (1959), 437-438.

BOOK REVIEWS

LE THÉÂTRE LIBRE D'ANTOINE. I, LE RÉPERTOIRE ÉTRANGER. By Francis Pruner. Paris: Les Lettres Modernes, 1958. 191 p.

What a joy it has been to review this book and to relive the battles of the great dramatic revolution which took place in Paris toward the end of the nineteenth century! I am a living relic of that famous *fin de siècle*. I knew many of the French playwrights, actors, and critics of the Théâtre Libre and spent many hours with its famous director, André Antoine. It was Antoine who opened the doors of his theater, and subsequently of all the theaters of Paris, to foreign playwrights and to Frenchmen, especially young and unknown writers, who could not get a hearing elsewhere because they flaunted the rules laid down by Dumas, Augier, Sardou, etc. It was Antoine who, supported by Zola, the Goncourts, and a small group of playwrights, novelists, and poets, founded the first of the pioneer little theaters of Europe and America. It was a theater which, because of its private subscriptions, was unfettered by censors, dramatic tabus, and matinée idols. From the Théâtre Libre sprang the German Freie Bühne and Freie Volksbühne, the Independent Theatre of London, Strindberg's theater in Copenhagen, and many another little theater. Antoine's Théâtre Libre was truly an international playhouse.

M. Pruner's book confines itself to a discussion of the foreign plays produced by the Théâtre Libre between the years 1888 and 1894. In minute detail he tells the story of Antoine's struggles and gives an excellent picture of the dramatic climate of Paris in the 1880s and 1890s. Although he lays undue stress on political considerations, such as the public coldness to anything German and the friendliness to France's ally, Russia, he gives a very good account of the behind-the-scenes details and the reactions of critics and public to foreign plays.

It is unfortunate that M. Pruner, who has had access to the Antoine archives, fails to mention in his bibliography and voluminous notes two source books on the Théâtre Libre, Adolphe Thalasso's *Théâtre Libre* (Paris, 1906) and Waxman's *Antoine and the Théâtre Libre* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1926). Both Thalasso and Waxman worked in collaboration with Antoine during his lifetime and have much to say about the plays which M. Pruner discusses. He might have documented himself more thoroughly and avoided errors of fact, had he consulted these two books. His second subtitle reads *Aux Sources de la dramaturgie moderne*; but he has not availed himself of all his sources.

Altogether eleven plays by foreign authors had a place in the repertory of the Théâtre Libre: two by Ibsen, two by Hauptmann, and one each by Tolstoy, Strindberg, Turgenev, Verga, Rzewuski, Heijermans, and Björnson. M. Pruner has divided his book into three "domaines." The first is entitled "Domaines slave et italien," which treats Tolstoy, Verga, Rzewuski, and Turgenev in the order named. In the second, "Domaine scandinave," Ibsen, Strindberg, and Björnson figure. The third part, "Domaine germanique," concerns itself with Hauptmann and Heijermans. Tolstoy's *Power of Darkness*, Ibsen's *Ghosts* and *Wild Duck*, Hauptmann's *Weavers* and *Hannele Mattern*, and Strindberg's *Miss Julia* are still im-

portant plays and merit the attention which M. Pruner gives them. But it is doubtful if the other authors deserve the detailed treatment allotted to them. The importance of their plays is much exaggerated.

Let us examine these minor prophets. Björnson's *Failure* is a tame piece, whose protagonist is a dishonest financier who in the end reforms. It offered nothing new to the Théâtre Libre. Balzac's *Faiseur* and Becque's *Corbeaux*, both of which preceded the days of the Théâtre Libre, offer far superior portrayals of unrepentant crooks. Antoine, who had seen Björnson's play performed by the Meiningen troupe, put it on as a filler-in because of its popularity. Verga and Turgenev were primarily novelists and had practically no influence on European drama. Verga's *Cavalleria rusticana* is chiefly remembered as a *succès de scandale* because of its ear-biting episode. The original short story is far superior to its dramatization. Mascagni made it universally known in operatic form. Turgenev's *Pain d'autrui* (A Poor Gentleman), a two-act trifle, passed almost entirely unnoticed. The fame of Rzewuski's *Comte Witold*, which was written in French, rests on the fact that the author was a nephew of Balzac's Mme Hanska. And so the "domaine slave" is reduced to Tolstoy's *Power of Darkness*. Heijermans' *Ahasvère* was his second, not his first, attempt in playwriting and was noticed chiefly because of the superb acting of Antoine in one of the principal roles. It originally passed as a French play (it was translated from the Dutch by the author, who was living at the time in Paris). Although M. Pruner is apparently unaware of the fact, the play originally appeared in Amsterdam and caused a furore because its author palmed it off as a work by a Russian named Ivan Jelakovich. Heijermans made a name for himself in Holland as a dramatist, but that was much later. To my mind the most important Dutchman connected with the free theater movement in Europe was Jacob T. Grein, who founded the Independent Theatre in London in 1891 and who produced there several plays of the Théâtre Libre.

I do not mean to belittle the one-act play with my harsh judgments on the works of Verga and Heijermans. Some of the finest plays of the Théâtre Libre were in one act. Very often an evening's performance was devoted entirely to three or four one-act plays. Banville's *Baiser* and Curel's *Chance de Françoise* are gems of dramatic composition done in the manner of Alfred de Musset, perhaps the greatest French dramatist of the nineteenth century, whose plays became models of the *pièce mal faite*, which disregards conventional dramatic technique. And what of the two-act play? M. Pruner makes the startling assertion that the two-act play is unacceptable to French audiences. If I were to name the outstanding French play of the Théâtre Libre it would be Courteline's *Boubouroche* in two acts. Furthermore Antoine, in and out of the Théâtre Libre, put on one of Brieux' finest plays, *Blanchette*, in two acts.

I should like to suggest that, if M. Pruner has an opportunity to revise his book, he discard "domaines" and put into more emphatic focus the works of Tolstoy, Ibsen, Hauptmann, and Strindberg, whose plays had a profound impact on French drama. Tolstoy's *Power of Darkness*, one of the most poignant tragedies of modern times, made its first appearance on any stage at the Théâtre Libre. Its performance had been forbidden in Russia. *The Power of Darkness* catapulted the young Théâtre Libre into international fame. Like Zola's *Thérèse Raquin* and Ibsen's *Ghosts*, it became one of the war horses of the free theaters of Europe. Ibsen's *Wild Duck* and Hauptmann's *Hannele Mattern* proved conclusively to hostile critics that Antoine's repertory was not entirely restricted to the violent type of play of the so-called naturalist school; although he esteemed Zola very highly

and was skeptical of Maeterlinck's worth as a dramatist, Antoine was not blindly prejudiced against the symbolist drama. With Hauptmann's *Weavers* Antoine taught French directors how to handle crowds on the stage, a lesson he himself had learned from the performances he had witnessed of the famous German theatrical company of the Duke of Meiningen.

Perhaps the most outstanding representative of the interrelations in European drama of the period under discussion is Strindberg, who in 1889 had founded a short-lived experimental theater in Copenhagen which was directly inspired by the Théâtre Libre. When Antoine produced *Miss Julia* he considered its preface so vital to his own revolutionary stage tactics that he distributed copies of it to his audience. A disciple of Zola, Strindberg was one of the most articulate enemies of the well-made play, *la pièce bien faite*. He would abolish the division of the play into acts. *Miss Julia*, really a two-act play, was performed by Antoine without *entr'acte*. Strindberg favored monologues and pantomime—which warmed the heart of Antoine, who so often turned his back to his audience that his theater was nicknamed *Le Dos d'Antoine*, Antoine's Back. Strindberg would avoid turning dramatic characters into catechists who ask asinine questions in order to call forth witty answers. He advocated the abolition of boxes and the elimination of the music of a visible orchestra. He was one of the first of the moderns to banish the footlight, still a curious anachronism of the contemporary stage. Antoine frequently performed plays without footlights. M. Pruner does not emphasize sufficiently these reciprocal influences.

I should like to add by way of footnote that it was Mérimée and not Daudet who wrote *Les Ames du Purgatoire*. The only typographical error which I have found is in the spelling of the word *pogrom* which appears twice as *progrom*.

SAMUEL M. WAXMAN

Boston University

AMERICAN LITERATURE AS VIEWED IN GERMANY, 1818-1861. By Harvey W. Hewett-Thayer. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. 83 p. (University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature, No. 22.)

In scope, this study is limited to an examination of the files of two literary journals, the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* (founded in 1818) and the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslands* (founded in 1832); other evidence of the German reaction to American literature is rarely considered. Chapter I deals with general survey articles, under such titles as "Amerikanischer Monatsbericht" or "Literatur, Beredsamkeit, und Poesie in den Vereinigten Staaten"; Chapter II ("The First Literary Invasion") with articles on Irving and Cooper; Chapter III ("The Voice of New England; and Melville") with reactions to Longfellow, Emerson, Hawthorne, Whittier, the historians Prescott, Motley, and Bancroft, but also Poe, and of course Melville (why is he mentioned separately in the chapter heading when Poe is not?); Chapter IV ("Widening Horizons") with discussions of a variety of figures, from W. G. Simms to Mrs. Stowe. There are also a conclusion, notes, an appendix giving the original German text of certain passages quoted in translation, and a name index.

Professor Hewett-Thayer has limited himself to giving a synopsis of what his two sources had to say about American books and writers; he summarizes, he reports, most of the time as if in the German voices of a hundred or more years ago; but he analyzes or judges little, except in the less than two pages of the conclusion. These are the major generalizations he allows himself: that "no clear and

consistent pattern" emerges from the "cumulative record of American literature as presented in these periodicals"; that individual reviewers often "differ fundamentally in their attitude" toward American authors or books; that a great deal of the material in the two German magazines is secondhand, adapted from French, British, and American journals (one might add that the *Revue des Deux Mondes* seems to have been laid under tribute with particular frequency and effect); that the attitude toward American culture is on the whole "more generous and appreciative than that of the British journals from which some of the specific information is derived"; not surprisingly perhaps, that "German reviewers frequently exaggerated the influence of German literature and German thought on the development of American culture"; and, finally, that the "very mass of material... constitutes an overwhelming proof of German interest in American life and culture."

It is perhaps ungrateful to quarrel with the design of the book. Yet certain questions obtrude themselves, and one would like to have had Professor Hewett-Thayer's answers. What are the reasons for the chapter divisions, especially between Chapters III and IV? Why are Margaret Fuller, A. B. Alcott, and Channing in chapter IV instead of appearing as New England voices in chapter III? Are the numbers of pages devoted to individual authors (Irving, 6; Cooper, 13; Melville, 2; Longfellow, 6; Emerson, 6; Channing, 2; but Poe and Hawthorne only half a page each) roughly proportionate to the attention they got in Germany, or at least in the *Blätter* and the *Magazin*? And Whitman, whose name does not appear—Was he still quite unknown in Germany five or six years after the first edition of *Leaves of Grass*? Since Professor Hewett-Thayer has not been able to present all the evidence he collected and since he comments so rarely in his own voice, such questions will not down.

There are few obvious errors (Irving's *Columbus* reviewed in 1826; *Monikans* for *Monikins*—though this seems to have been an error of the German commentator, who puns on *Mohicans*). Here and there the documentation lacks clarity. But, above all, one wonders every now and then what is left out. Professor Hewett-Thayer's last note teases: "It has not been the province of this article to note the numerous factual errors, for example, that... Poe wandered as a beggar in Russia and was sent home." With what other *Delikatessen* did the hungry sentimental imagination stuff itself?

But, regardless of what Professor Hewett-Thayer does not tell us, we must be grateful for what he provides. His compilation serves a useful purpose. On the one hand, the Germans of a hundred years ago—or the Englishmen, Americans, and Frenchmen whose comments they handed on—were capable of good judgment: Melville's *Mardi* is a "strange medley of grotesque farce and fantastic grandeur"; Irving is more man of the world than poet; Cooper's humor is "corpulent." On the other hand, the spirited repetition of the tired commonplaces about American materialism ("Where the axe, the revolver, the bowie knife, counterfeit bills, bales of cotton or hogsheads of syrup wrung from the toil of Negroes, where these rule men, no sun is possible that could shine on pen or brush"), the gratifying self-deceptions ("To the educated German reader it will be an interesting revelation that American literature has derived its models and its initial stimulus less from the English motherland than from Germany"), and the attention paid to writers now all but forgotten make Professor Hewett-Thayer's little document in cultural relations a lesson in the whims of literary taste and human judgment.

CHRISTOF WEGELIN

University of Oregon

SHAKESPEARE'S STAGE. By A. M. Nagler. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. x, 118 p.

Professor Nagler agrees with C. Walter Hodges in *The Globe Restored* (1953) on several details concerning the Elizabethan playhouse and its stage. For example, he follows Hodges (rightly, I believe) in rejecting the inn-yard theory of origin of the public playhouse in favor of the theory that the playhouses were designed after the bear- and bull-baiting houses that stood on Bankside during the middle of the sixteenth century (p. 16). (But what, if anything, were the baiting houses designed after?) Nagler also follows Hodges (again rightly, to my mind) in supposing a public-theater stage around six feet high—really the only tenable position in view of contemporary pictorial evidence regarding height of stage (p. 5). One heaves a sigh of relief, considering our complete lack of evidence for the Globe stage and tiring house, to hear Nagler forego "reconstruction" of the Globe (p. 18): "I do not aspire to reconstruct the stage of the Globe playhouse. The undertaking strikes me as hopeless." One is also pleased to see Nagler's suggestion that the hangings shown in the *Roxana* and *Messalina* vignettes conceal the whole breadth of the tiring-house façade (pp. 50-51). Nagler points out the need for a "thorough study" of Elizabethan stage costumes; his own modest essay on the subject is a very good one (pp. 86-91). And in what he has to say about Elizabethan acting style he contributes a telling argument to the current debate on convention versus psychological realism (p. 81):

"The mere fact that, while Burbage played Macbeth, an adolescent impersonated Lady Macbeth seems to me to exclude any possibility of realism. A lad of sixteen could not possibly have played Lady Macbeth realistically. There was only one way to make the figure credible: stylization. And if the young player stylized Lady Macbeth, the adult Burbage must also have stylized. An inconsistency of technique is inconceivable. The adult portrayer of Romeo on the platform of the Theatre and the apprentice disguised as Juliet on the gallery or pavilion roof must be reduced to a common denominator, and this common denominator can only be style."

Some of Nagler's ideas, however, warrant challenge. His assumption of multiple traps is much too glib (pp. 23-24). It is based on slight and ambiguous evidence; it ignores the fact that the evidence at large is preponderantly in favor of a single trap; and it smells suspiciously of the nineteenth-century theater. Again, it seems uncritical of Nagler to accept (p. 66) the theory of a third-level music room put forward by John Cranford Adams in *The Globe Playhouse* (1942). The theory is architecturally improbable, it is based on irrelevant or questionable evidence, and it denies alternative theories regarding the location of musicians for which there is good evidence. Again, Nagler suggests that the Swan was exceptional in having vertical stage posts to support the roof or cover over the stage, this in opposition to the usual view that the Hope was exceptional in *not* having such supports (pp. 24-25). The suggestion neglects the consideration that there was a reason for the Hope's being exceptional in this matter: its yard (apparently alone among those of the several public playhouses) was used for the baiting of animals as well as the performance of plays; hence the stage had to be removable, and the stage cover also had to be supported in the cantilevered manner so brilliantly inferred by Hodges on the evidence of Hollar's "long view" of London. Again, Nagler writes (p. 4): "We know little about the physical appearance of the Theatre and still less about that of the nearby Curtain Playhouse." Here he has apparently forgotten that the Curtain is depicted in a panoramic view of London from the north discov-

ered by Leslie Hotson and published by him in the London *Times* of March 26, 1954. Finally, Nagler's theories of a "discovery space" and of a "raised playing area" seem especially open to question.

It is to these last vexing problems that I should like to devote the remainder of this review. Nagler would solve both problems by postulating a curtained structure (which he calls a "tent" or "pavilion") set up on the stage directly in front of the tiring house, either in front of the middle door of a three-door tiring house or between the doors of a two-door tiring house (p. 46); and he supposes that this pavilion can be rigidly roofed so as to provide a small "upper stage" (p. 49). (Nagler accepts also the familiar theory of an upper stage in the second level of the tiring house.) In this general conception he is again following Hodges, one of whose special contributions was the idea of an upper stage atop what he called a "booth" set up against the tiring-house façade. But, inasmuch as the theory of a curtained structure upon the stage is designed as an alternative to the nineteenth-century theory of an "inner stage," it is essentially the same as that elaborated by George F. Reynolds in *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater* (1940). Curiously, Nagler does not mention this book, one of the best that has been written on the Elizabethan stage.

The theory of a curtained structure upon the stage is attractive, since it is supported by the analogy of curtained "houses" or "mansions" at Court and of a curtained "booth" at the back of the contemporary street stages. Nevertheless, and despite the authority of Reynolds and Hodges, the theory is unsatisfactory. For one thing, it does not account for discoveries that evidently took place behind the tiring-house façade ("in the middle of the place behind the stage"). A good example occurs in Jasper Mayne's *City Match*, a Whitehall and Blackfriars play of around 1637: "*Draws the curtaine within are discovered Bright & Newcut... they come out.*" For another, there is no extant evidence for such a structure in the regular Elizabethan theaters, either in pictorial sources (three of which show, instead, hangings decorating a tiring-house façade) or in Henslowe's famous list of properties at the Rose in 1598. This absence of evidence can be explained (as I have suggested in an unpublished paper) by supposing that the tiring house of a permanent Elizabethan theater (whether public or private) corresponded generally to a "house" at Court or to the "booth" at the back of a street stage. I consider it improbable that players would have set up a small booth in front of what was in effect their large booth—the tiring house itself. But very probably Professor Nagler would not agree with this judgment.

Regardless of how sound it may be to postulate a curtained structure upon the stage, Nagler's inconsistency in applying that postulate is disturbing. He rejects the notion of an "inner stage" at the Globe. Here I certainly agree with him (though I wish he had given his reasons). But then he about-faces and postulates an inner stage at the Blackfriars on the very slim argument that the Blackfriars stage was smaller that that of the Globe, and hence that there would have been insufficient room for a curtained structure upon the stage. (I call this argument "slim" because it proposes no precise dimensions—how large is a stage smaller than one you don't know the size of?—and because the Blackfriars hall was wide enough, 46 feet, to have accommodated, at one end, a stage 30 or more feet wide and hence itself large enough to have accommodated a good-sized booth in front of the tiring-house façade.) If there was no inner stage at the Globe, why should there have been one at the Blackfriars? (Or, for that matter, in any Elizabethan playhouse?) The inconsistency is the more noticeable since Nagler presently con-

cludes, though on the basis of a questionable premise, that conditions of production at the Blackfriars were essentially the same as at the Globe (p. 102). Again I agree. But, if so and if there was no inner stage at the Globe, what reason is there to suppose an inner stage at the Blackfriars?

The questionable premise is that *Cymbeline, The Winter's Tale,* and *The Tempest* were designed for original performance at the Blackfriars (p. 95). Nagler here refers to the article on the Blackfriars by Gerald Eades Bentley in *Shakespeare Survey 1* (1948). But he just perceptibly alters Bentley's terms. Bentley did not advance a conclusive demonstration that these plays were designed for the Blackfriars; he merely made out a good case for supposing that they were. His argument is persuasive; but, if we used as a criterion Alfred Harbage's distinction between "coterie" and "popular" subject matter in *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (1952), we might well suppose that all three plays were designed for the Globe. I can see no "objective" means of determining whether these plays, for which we have no external evidence regarding the theater of original performance, were designed for the Globe or for the Blackfriars. Hence their evidence may not be cited in an argument concerning the stage of either playhouse. The point is of some consequence, for it nullifies Nagler's conclusion that the Blackfriars stage was equipped with suspension gear. The stage may have been so equipped, but the demonstration should be based on evidence definitely relevant to the Blackfriars alone.

I would question also the way in which Nagler supposes his pavilion or tent was used as a discovery space. Except that the pavilion is a temporary structure projecting from the tiring-house façade, it seems to be conceived of in almost exactly the same manner as the classic inner stage that Nagler himself would like to escape from. This can be illustrated by comparison of his exposition of the staging of *Romeo and Juliet* with that recently proposed by Irwin Smith in *Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse* (1956), a book much influenced by the theories of John Cranford Adams. Nagler definitely suggests eight uses of his pavilion or tent as a playing-area:

Shakespeare's Stage	Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse
(1) *Act I, Scene v*	
"... the tent opens for the servingmen's scene in the Capulet house ... The scene begins in the tent but spreads over the platform: after a time, tent and platform together form the hall.... The tent closes..." (pp. 54-55).	"... the curtains of the rear stage open to reveal the inner stage as the Capulet ballroom ... Now that the curtains are open, the entire stage, platform as well as inner stage, becomes a hall in the Capulet house ... the stage curtains close" (p. 165).
(2) *Act II, Scene vi*	
"The tent opens, and in it we discover Friar Lawrence and Romeo ... At the end of the scene the tent closes" (p. 56).	"... the action returns to the rear stage as to the Friar's cell. Romeo and the Friar are discovered by the opening of the curtains ... At the end ... the stage curtains close" (p. 170).

(3) *Act III, Scene iii*

"The tent opens ... The tent closes at the end of the scene" (p. 57).	"As the stage curtains open, the Friar enters ... At the scene's end ... the Friar is concealed by closing curtains" (p. 171).

(4) *Act IV, Scene i*

"The Friar, Paris, and Juliet appear in the tent, and then it closes once more" (p. 58).	"Friar Lawrence and the County Paris are discovered by the opening of the curtains ... the curtains close" (p. 175).

(5) *Act IV, Scene iii*

"... the tent is opened, disclosing Juliet's bed ... The tent is closed" (*ibid.*).	Played above (pp. 176-177).

(6) *Act IV, Scene v*

"The tent is reopened ... the curtains of the tent are closed ..." (pp. 58-59).	Played mainly above, partly on the stage (pp. 176-178).

(7) *Act V, Scene ii*

"The tent opens ..., and then the curtain closes" (p. 59).	Played on the stage (pp. 178-179).

(8) *Act V, Scene iii*

"... Juliet's tomb is set up in the tent, which opens ... Romeo carries Paris' corpse into the tent ... Friar Lawrence ... and ... Balthasar ... enter the tent and find the dead Romeo" (*ibid.*).	"The curtains of the inner stage open to reveal a pair of gates stretching across the aperture of the rear stage and concealing its interior ... The gates now stand ajar ... Romeo ... picks up the body of Paris and carries it within [the inner stage] ... Whether the gates close earlier or later, they conceal the four bodies [including Tybalt's] in the inner stage ..." (pp. 179-171).

Smith's questionable assumption of property gates behind the curtains of his inner stage is a notable variation from Nagler's interpretation. Otherwise the basic conceptions of the two writers are very similar, even though each uses his discovery space for different actions and each places certain (though not the same) "chamber" actions in a curtained space above.

The surprising thing is that Nagler's (and Smith's) numerous uses of a discovery space are not authorized by our texts of *Romeo and Juliet* (Q1 and Q2). The texts themselves pose only two problems involving curtains or a discovery space. One problem is the "curtains" that conceal Juliet in IV, iii and IV, v. These can have been the curtains of a bed "thrust out" upon the stage for IV, iii, left there during IV, iv, and removed (with Juliet in it) toward the end of IV, v. The other problem is Juliet's "tomb" in V, iii. This can have been the space directly behind a large, double-hung stage-door opening upon the stage. In this space the sleeping Juliet can be discovered, her body later being concealed by closing the door or, if she falls upon the stage, being carried off stage by attendant players

along with the bodies of Romeo and Paris. Excepting actions above in II, ii and III, v (presumably played from one of the windows of the Lords' room), all other actions in *Romeo and Juliet* can be played simply upon the stage (nor is there any reason to suppose that they were played otherwise). Thus the stage and tiring house recorded by de Witt in the Swan drawing would have required no adaptation for performance of *Romeo and Juliet*.

The problem of a "raised playing area" is hardly less difficult than that of a discovery space. As we have seen, Nagler accepts Hodges' theory of a small upper stage atop a curtained booth (the "pavilion") set up against the tiring-house façade. Objections to such a structure as a discovery space may be urged also against the structure as a raised playing area, there being in addition the problem of access from the tiring-house gallery down to the upper stage roofing the pavilion. Nagler also accepts the old idea of an "upper stage" (which he calls a "gallery" or "balcony") in the second level of the tiring house.

(Presumably, since he accepts Juliet's "descent" in III, v of *Romeo and Juliet*, Nagler would not endorse Adams' theory of "chamber" action above; hence it is difficult to understand why he places two actions above which should not be there—II, v and III, ii, p. 57.)

The following remarks are directed toward the "orthodox" theory that action above was generally performed in the second level of the tiring house, whether this is conceived of as an unpartitioned "upper stage" equipped with curtains and open-work balustrade or as an uncurtained "gallery" partitioned into boxes like those apparently in the Swan drawing and the *Roxana* vignette.

As is well known, theory about a raised playing area in the second level of the tiring house is complicated by evidence for a "Lords' room" or "rooms." Nagler assumes that the Lords' rooms were boxes in the lowermost gallery of the playhouse frame, on either side of the tiring house. Thus they would have corresponded to the "gentlemen's rooms" of the Fortune contract and to the "orchestra" in de Witt's sketch of the Swan (p. 108). But this interpretation flies in the teeth of the evidence—pictures showing spectators in a gallery over the stage (the Swan drawing, the *Roxana* vignette, and the *Wits* frontispiece) and allusions to the custom of sitting "over the stage" or "over the stage i' the Lords roome" (*Every Man out of his Humour*). To sustain his interpretation, Nagler must assume that these side boxes (whose floors were probably below the level of the stage) were referred to generally as "over" the stage. Yet Dekker makes precisely the distinction we should expect by referring, in *The Gull's Hornbook*, to the gentlemen's rooms as "next" the stage. It seems to me that Nagler is wrong in suggesting that the Lords' room was not over the stage in the tiring house.

To support his interpretation, he argues that the de Witt drawing depicts a rehearsal, the figures in the second level of the tiring house being actors or theater personnel, "who were following the rehearsal from the gallery and perhaps waiting for their cue" (pp. 10-11). (Here Nagler might have referred to the article by Martin Holmes in *Theatre Notebook* for 1956.) But, as Régis Dorbe points out in an unpublished thesis on the iconography of the Elizabethan stage (Toulouse, 1958), the hoisted playhouse flag and the trumpeter in the hut over the stage clearly indicate that de Witt was present at a regular performance. And in any case, why should de Witt (or van Buchell) have troubled to depict audience in a sketch for travel notes (or a commonplace book)? Let the reader sketch a theater for his private notes and determine for himself the likelihood of audience being included in such a sketch. And is Nagler prepared to argue that the Roxana vignette and the

Wits frontispiece, which both also show spectators above and behind the stage, also depict rehearsals?

But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Swan drawing *does* depict a rehearsal. It by no means follows that the gallery over the stage was not a Lords' room.

Why does Nagler adopt this untenable position? I suspect because, as is clear from his note "Shakespeare's Arena Demolished" in *The Shakespeare Newsletter* for 1956, he is so firmly opposed to Leslie Hotson's theory of "transpicuous" houses standing free upon an "arena" stage. In his book Nagler says (p. 11):

"Recently, Leslie Hotson (26) has once more identified the persons in the gallery [shown in the Swan drawing] as members of the audience and mobilized them in support of his fantastic theory that Shakespeare produced his plays 'in the round.' Hotson (27) developed this hypothesis on the basis of a mistaken interpretation of an Italian document regarding Court performances, and transferred the 'arena' of the Queen's Court to the public theatres."

But, whether Hotson's theory is right or wrong, Hotson is mistaken in supposing that it is supported by evidence for a Lords' room over the stage in the tiring house; and Nagler is similarly mistaken in supposing that his denial of a Lords' room over the stage in the tiring house helps to "demolish" Shakespeare's "arena."

My own view of this controversial matter is that Hotson has failed (and Nagler with him) to make sufficient distinction between performance "in the round" and performance "on an arena stage." The two modes of production are not necessarily the same. If spectators are situated in each of four quadrants surrounding a stage, performance on that stage may certainly be described as "in the round." This is the situation that we see in the Swan drawing, for that document records spectators in a gallery above and behind the stage (the Lords' room). So Hotson is right and Nagler is wrong. Yet if a stage, though "open" to audience on three sides, is backed on the fourth side by a screen or façade, that stage is certainly not an "arena" stage. Anyone who has attended an arena-stage performance or been to the circus can testify that the de Witt sketch does not show an arena stage. So Hotson is wrong and Nagler is right. Apparently, the problem is more complex than either will allow—Hotson who would deny that players delivered speeches from a gallery over the stage and Nagler who would deny that the gallery over the stage was a Lords' room. A more economical theory (suggested in essence by W. J. Lawrence in *The Elizabethan Playhouse* in 1912) is that the gallery over the stage was indeed a Lords' room and that it was occasionally used by players as well as constantly by audience. All we need do is recognize the limited demands made upon a raised playing area by action above in Elizabethan plays, and then abandon the theory of an "upper stage" for which there is no evidence anyway.

Professor Nagler's approach to the Elizabethan stage is both authoritative and perceptive, as one would expect of a scholar so well versed in the sources of theater history. I have felt constrained to disagree with him on certain topics, but disagreement is perhaps inevitable in reviewing a book on such a difficult subject. His book is a useful and stimulating contribution to the literature of that subject. It was written originally in German, and the translation, by Ralph Manheim, is crisp and fluent. A reproduction of the Swan drawing serves as frontispiece.

RICHARD HOSLEY

University of Missouri

FORSCHUNGSPROBLEME DER VERGLEICHENDEN LITERATURGESCHICHTE. II. Folge, herausgegeben von Fritz Ernst und Kurt Wais. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 1958. 199 p.

When the first Folge of *Forschungsprobleme* appeared in 1951 (same publisher), hope was for rapid sequels, perhaps in annual sequence. The problems which Kurt Wais pointed up in his introductory essay in the 1951 volume ("Vergleichende Literaturbetrachtung," pp. 7-11) are of the most pressing order. Their systematic solution will in due course benefit all literary criticism in specific and vital ways. But now that II. Folge is here, it proves that "gut Ding will gute Weile haben"; it was well worth waiting for.

The book, bound to resemble the first issue but printed more carefully on finer stock, contains an introduction by Kurt Wais, an *in memoriam* for Fritz Ernst by Daniel Bodmer (Zürich), twelve articles of varying length and scope, and the useful index of names which could not be provided in I. Folge.

The eclectic scope of subjects reflects in a pleasantly natural, unforced way the complex, multidirectional interrelations of Western literatures. For historical reasons—French, German, and Swiss scholars were among the first to conceive of true comparatism, and there is merit in the observation that Herder was its progenitor—the Franco-German exchange has received the lion's share of attention. There are, also, one paper on Anglo-German relations (Wilkinson), one on Anglo-French (Guyard), one on Italian-French-German (Otter), a report on the state of comparatism in Holland (van der Lee), a biographical sketch of Paul Betz (Bodmer), a detailed and informative study on folk poetry in the eighteenth century (Fritz Ernst), and finally an excellent study on the role of comparatism in American colleges (Friederich).

The pleasantly human introduction is an effective *captatio benevolentiae*. Professor Wais' personal charm pervades his writing almost as much as his conversation. He senses the significance of the Swabian-Swiss *Kulturkreis* as a center of radiation and exchange—he speaks with pointed emphasis of "das alemannisch nachbarliche Tübingen" in relation to Fritz Ernst—and his appreciation of Ernst's evolution from *Helvetismus* to *Europäismus* to *Kosmopolitismus* ("die Lehre von der Welterkenntnis und dem Weltbürgertum") proves him a true humanist in the modern sense of the word. It is this spirit, manifest throughout the collection, which raises its significance above that of purely scholarly *Fachliteratur*.

Among the twelve articles, two stand out in quality, substance, and weight: Kurt Wais' "Das Schrifttum der französischen Aufklärung in seinem Nachleben von Feuerbach bis Nietzsche. Ein Kapitel deutsch-französischer Begegnung," and Werner P. Friederich's "Zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte in den Vereinigten Staaten."

The Franco-German *rapprochement*, seemingly so difficult of realization and yet so necessary for the pacification of Europe, forms the point of departure for Professor Wais' exhaustive survey. Three complementary trends shape his thinking:

First is the overcoming of political prejudice. The two world wars and the National Socialist catastrophe frame the author's life (born 1909). He cannot and does not ignore them. But, instead of seducing him into sterile diatribes (excusable perhaps in the humanitarian anguish of a great poet), these "facts of life" sharpen his sensitivity to the intrinsic values on both sides of the Rhine. With rare insight

he has understood the inextricable interplay of politics, philosophy, and literature in European intellectual life, and this understanding has become fruitful in his literary criticism.

Second is the overcoming of literary prejudice. Here Wais feels that we are in full advance. The main efforts in the field of criticism, not only comparatist but also more specifically specialized, in New Criticism, *explication de texte, Kunst der Interpretation*, appear to him to be unmistakably in that direction. The hope is that careful systematic progress on the entire front will secure a critical position which is both objective and capable of serving as a basis for meaningful value judgments.

Third is an associative history of ideas which excludes nothing for categorical reasons and encourages the search for ever new relationships in the realm of the spirit. The end result should be synthesis rather than analysis, interpretation rather than criticism.

Equally important on a comparable, though different level is Werner P. Friederich's report to our European colleagues on a matter which very few of them, even in England, ever seem really to understand—the many complex factors which combine to determine the shape and the form of our undergraduate and graduate courses. He rightly stresses the many human requirements which the college-university system imposes on the teacher-scholar in this country. Again and again visiting European professors are amazed at the amount of time and effort we spend on guidance, on questions and problems which may appear primitive or even childish to an elder engrossed in his advanced work, but which are vitally important to the teenager facing success or failure in college. It is in its humaneness and its flexibility that the American approach primarily excels.

This valuable preamble leads the author to a concise and lucid historical survey of comparatism in America, with its waves of adherence to the different schools and its eventual emancipation under the leadership of men like René Wellek, David Malone, Harry Levin, Victor Lange, and last, but not least, Professor Friederich himself. The paper ends with a plea for mutual understanding in which the traditional role of Friederich's native Switzerland is justly cited as an inspiring example. (It might be useful to the reader to point out that the first line of p. 184 should be transposed to the bottom of the page.)

The other papers vary in depth and range. Daniel Bodmer's biography of Louis Paul Betz is a little jewel, soigné, beautifully organized, and exquisitely written. There is an inimitable civilized tone which makes many of these pieces particularly attractive. Dino Otter, in his final note (p. 122), admits that his paper "represents a preparatory step for the author's monograph on Luigi Capuana." Johannes Hösle's survey of "German Narrative and Lyric Poetry of the Turn of the Century Reflected in French Periodicals Between 1900 and 1914" is carefully collated and documented, informative, and dependable in detail.

Ernst Merian-Genast's essay on the "French and German Translator's Art" is an imaginative, searching, and thoughtful contribution to the age-old controversy of *Nachdichtung* versus transliteration. He acknowledges the exasperating fact that ever and again near-perfect translations do appear (parts of the Luther Bible and of the King James, or even such smaller pieces as the 1919 anonymous German Insel Verlag selection from Oscar Wilde), refers us back to Luther's fundamental *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*, and then outlines a useful history of reciprocal Franco-German efforts in this field. The most stimulating passages are those where the author traces the psychological motivations for the subtle changes

and adaptations which so often give the foreign-language version of a literary work of art its own peculiar flavor. I was reminded of Emil Staiger's chapter "Entstellte Zitate" in his *Kunst der Interpretation.*

Professor Merian-Genast documents a vast erudition, as does Fritz Ernst in his paper on "The Discovery of Folk Poetry in the 18th Century." By contrast, Walter Höllerer's interpretative piece, "Beast and the Smile," leaves me rather unhappy. A reviewer in *Literaturanzeiger* (III 1959, p. 6) writes, "Bei W. Höllerer ... übersteigt die Pointierung schon den Ertrag." This may be unnecessarily cruel, but the paper does leave much to be desired. I do not necessarily object to the language, although "Pointierung" is an excellent description of Höllerer's style. This is, after all, external, as is the author's lack of consistency in providing translations for his quotations. It seems to me that there are graver substantial faults. The author's considerable facility of expression occasionally seduces him into vague or superficial formulations and into what appears to me to be downright errors (last paragraph of p. 49 and first paragraph of p. 50—what the author sees here simply is not in the text; in this connection, I should be interested to hear his definition of *erlebte Rede.*) His polemical remark against Erich Auerbach (p. 51) is uncalled-for and factually incorrect. In his *Mimesis,* Auerbach does *not* "ignore" (*übergehen*) Büchner, as a glance at the index would have shown Höllerer. On p. 399 (Bern edition, 1946) Auerbach draws Büchner conclusively into the cycle of his argument.

The other papers are all competently done.

RANSOM TAYLOR

University of North Carolina

LES FLANDRES DANS LES MOUVEMENTS ROMANTIQUE ET SYMBOLISTE. Actes du second Congrès National de Littérature Comparée. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1958. 202 p.

The first conference of the Société Française de Littérature Comparée, held in Bordeaux March 2-4, 1956, devoted to an investigation of "General Literature and History of Ideas," was an auspicious beginning, judging by the follow-up it inspired in Lille a year later (May 30 to June 2, 1957). The thirty-seven papers read (twelve at Bordeaux and twenty-five at Lille) are impressive proof—if proof were needed—of the vigor, depth, and range of contemporary French comparatist scholarship.

The society's plan, obviously an orderly progression from the general to the specific, reflects the ideas of the founding fathers of French comparatism. We know with what specific meaning Paul van Tieghem coined the term "littérature générale" and what he and men like Paul Hazard (whose memory was specially honored during and after the conference), Marcel Bataillon, Jean-Marie Carré, and Fernand Baldensperger hoped from the future. The theme for the second *congrès national,* the Low Countries in recent French-language literature, was singularly well chosen. Regional studies of this type, conducted with a consciousness of their place in an overall plan, or at least coordinated under a common concept, provide one practical approach to the realization of those ambitious aspirations. The many varied viewpoints, the combinations and cross-references with geography, history, economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, the very con-

tradictions and differences of opinion which appear in these papers, in concert clear the air and prepare a sound basis for knowledge.

The individual offerings contained in such collections inevitably vary in quality. It is quite obvious that some pieces are pickings from a longer work planned by the author, while others were put together specially for the occasion; some, like M. Munteano's and M. Trénard's excellent methodological pieces or M. Décaudin's clear and beautifully written discussion of Belgian and French symbolism, offer considerable substance, while others, e.g., M. Zaleski's three pages on "Verhaeren and Poland," do little more than point up a problem. Not that the long papers are necessarily "better" than the short ones! Mlle Batard's picture of Paul Claudel as a critic of Flemish and Dutch art ("painting"?—the program on p. xi reads *art*, the title on p. 179 reads *peinture*), just over five pages, a quarter of which are quotations, is superbly done, imaginative, clever, and full of stimulating associations. But it is in the discussion of subjects such as influence, rhythm, symbolism, and imagery, and in the definition of literary periods in the area under discussion —romanticism, impressionism (M. Décaudin), expressionism, symbolism—that the real contribution of this conference was—or was not—made.

The volume lists the members of the honor and the patronage committees, the conferees, and the program; there is a word of thanks to the French Secretary of National Education and other officials by M. Jacques Voisine, secretary of the conference; a preface by the president of the Académie de Lille, M. Guy Debeyre, fittingly introduces the theme; M. Marcel Bataillon, of the Collège de France, contributes the introduction. The twenty-two papers which follow are thoughtfully organized into four sections: Methodology, five; Romanticism, three; Symbolism, eleven; and "Between Symbolism and the Twentieth Century," three. Two abstracts of papers which could not be printed, one dealing with methodology and one with romanticism, are included, as well as mention of a third, the title of which places it in the symbolist category.

This organizational pattern is, perhaps, a little primitive. Certainly some of the papers (e.g., that of M. Gillet, who enters at length into the history of ideas versus the history of language, p. 46, or that of M. de Graaf—his name is misspelled at the top of pp. 111 through 115—who essentially does little but discuss a certain Flemish literary journal) fit only tenuously into its frame. I wonder whether it was created ex post facto by the eminently capable editors headed by Professor Voisine, once all the papers were in, or whether it was devised in advance? In any event, scholarly individualism could (fortunately!) not be submerged.

One of the most remarkable demonstrations of this independent spirit is M. Guitte's idea that the symbolist linguistic formulae are either schematizations or of foreign, especially English, origin. One is tempted to wonder to what extent the author had his tongue in his cheek, i.e., whether perhaps his intention was to "agacer le bourgeois pour le faire penser." In any event, his thesis is forcefully presented and the piece is splendidly written, informative, and highly challenging.

The same may be said of M. Munteano's exposition of what he calls "the law of agreement" (*convenance* and *déconvenance*) and local atmosphere (*couleur locale*), both specific and carefully defined concepts in his terminology, in their relationship to the space-time manifold. His argumentation, supported by a wealth of detail and brilliantly logical, carries him forward step by step to a number of convincing conclusions. He establishes the triangle author-literary work of art-audience, demolishes *en passant* the categories of "internal" and "external" relationships between them, and persuasively replaces them with those of "personal,

human" (in German we might say *Geist*) and "impersonal, natural" (*Natur*), which he identifies as "the two dimensions of the cosmos" (Hermann Hesse would certainly agree). Then, having established a *tabula rasa* for his principal argument, he demonstrates a number of novel applications of his approach, not the least interesting of which is his aside on translation (p. 13).

A number of conferees (MM. Bornecque, Stremooukhoff, Godlewski, Corrales, and Del Litto) trace specific "influences" (of the type "Ibsen and Jan Kasprowicz," "Verhaeren in Russia"), with varying degrees of depth perception, sensitivity, and success. I admit to some doubts concerning the validity of M. Escarpit's minuscule statistics. He looks at 937 writers, and then discards 927; only ten were born in the Low Lands and write in French. Of these ten, two are classified as novelists, five as lyrical poets, one as a dramatist, and seven as "writers of miscellaneous prose." The total exceeds ten because several permit of multiple classification. From this, M. Escarpit proceeds to make rather sweeping deductions ("une *forte* [italics mine!] tendance à la poésie, trait dominant," p. 32). He then admits that his statistical base is too small to allow "des conséquences rigoureuses," but does not retract or even weaken the consequences which he has, in fact, drawn a moment earlier. Even so, the immense difficulties of elucidating literary influence of any kind stamp any attempt to deal with them as brave, and in general the conferees deal with influences intelligently and imaginatively.

When I first read the theme of the conference, I looked forward, perhaps naively, to a detailed discussion of poetic imagery. In this, I was disappointed. A number of papers mention image, and Mlle Frandon, in her sensitive article on Georges Rodenbach, touches several times on the all-important water image ("Rodenbach impose à l'eau, symbole de la vie et de la mort, une présentation originale" (p. 119), but that is all. There is no development, no conclusion, nor, indeed, is imagery pursued anywhere else. The word "symbol" too comes in for a variety of more or less superficial uses but never becomes a gateway into the depths of meaning and significance of symbolist poetry.

I was particularly sorry not to find M. Marius Dargaud's article on Étienne de Jouy, "L'Hermite de la Chausée d'Antin"; that would seem an ideal subject for comparatist study.

One must salute the outstanding stylists among the contributors, M. Bataillon for his powerful and terse precision, M. Bornecque for his splendid rhetoric, and M. Décaudin for his exemplary clarity. In form as well as in content, much of this work represents a significant contribution to scholarship.

RANSOM TAYLOR

University of North Carolina

THE ART OF BEOWULF. By Arthur Gilchrist Brodeur. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959. ix, 283 p.

The Art of Beowulf is the fruit of forty years of loving study and inspired teaching of the Old English epic. Never before, except perhaps in the many penetrating articles of Adrien Bonjour, has the art of this heroic poem received such an extensive and intensive scrutiny. But, whereas Bonjour's investigations have been separate studies, Arthur G. Brodeur's several analyses in the chapters of this book are all germane to one central investigation: of the ways in which the

poet handled his conventional material—from the inherited pattern of word formation through the inherited subjects and concepts—with originality. "What concerns us," Mr. Brodeur writes, leaving no doubt as to his high estimation of the poet's art, "is ... the degree of [the poet's] power to infuse with dignity, eloquence, and beauty the conventions which he accepted, or to transcend their reach without violating their essential limits ... *Beowulf* has ... a marked individuality, a unique grandeur, of diction and of style."

In his first two chapters, on diction and the use of variation—the most technical and the most original in the book, opening up as they do a new approach to the study of individual poetic style among Old English poems—Mr. Brodeur first takes pains to refute F. P. Magoun's recently advanced theory that *Beowulf*, along with other Old English narrative poetry, is almost totally formulaic and traditional and as such must have been orally composed by an unlettered singer. Citing the poet's almost indisputable knowledge of the Old Testament, of patristic writings, and (probably) of the *Aeneid*, making logical inferences from the case of Cynewulf, and adducing *Brunanburh* as an almost totally formulaic poem obviously written by an educated man, he effectively disposes of the contention that *Beowulf* must have been written by an unlettered scop. On the basis of an extensive examination of substantive simplices and compounds and of adjective compounds in *Beowulf* and other Old English poems and in Old English prose (the substantive and the adjective being the two most important elements in the poetic diction), he further demonstrates the vitality of the *Beowulf* poet in coining compounds to express the richness of his thought and feeling, in employing words which the traditional poetic vocabulary could not possibly have possessed.

Mr. Brodeur then proceeds to analyze Old English poetic compounds qualitatively. Among other things, he applies the Old Norse (or at least Snorri's) distinction between kennings and *kend heiti* to the Old English poetic coinages: a kenning being a periphrastic appellation in which the base word identifies some thing or person with something it is *not* (e.g., *hildenaedre* "battle-adder" for "arrow"), a *kent heiti* being a more direct periphrasis identifying the referent with something which it *is* (e.g., *haeðstapa* "heath-stepper" for "stag"). He attempts to distinguish between the degrees of poetic quality in such compounds as *fiċbeam* "figtree," *gleobeam* "glee-wood" for "harp," *deaðbeam* "death-tree" for "the forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden," *sigebeam* "victory-wood" for "the Cross," and *garbeam* "spear-tree" for "warrior" (the last a true kenning) and to distinguish between these compounds and true metaphors, which appear rarely in Old English poetry. Though one may not always agree with the necessarily subjective evaluations of the appropriateness of the figures of speech the author analyzes, it is distinctly pleasurable and profitable to have them so laid before us.

More than this, Mr. Brodeur shows how the *Beowulf* poet used adjectives and nouns in striking progressions, for example, "the sequence of epithets in lines 2419b-20, immediately used to describe Beowulf's state of mind, but serving also to foreshadow his impending death:

> '... Him waes geomor sefa,
> waefre ond waelfus ...'

The first two of these adjectives are common enough; the third and strongest is peculiar to *Beowulf*. The three are grouped climactically: the hero's spirit was 'gloomy,' 'wavering,' 'ready for bloody death.' Through them the poet prepares

the audience's mind for what is to come, and fixes the dominant tone." (It might be further noticed here that line 2419b is totally formulaic—see my article in *Speculum* XXX, 1955, 200-206—and yet in its context assumes extratraditional meaning and implication.) In passing, Mr. Brodeur makes an important comment on the dating of the poem, noting that Dorothy Whitelock's argument that *Beowulf* had too large a Christian element in its language to permit a date of composition as early as 725 will not hold up under the scrutiny he has given the compounds in *Beowulf* and in the religious poetry; for the Christian element in the *Beowulf* vocabulary is not much larger than that of Caedmon's *Hymn* and way below that of *Daniel* and of *Exodus*. Chapter I concludes that "the compounds in *Beowulf* are formed and used with more precision and restraint than those of most other poems" and that "a very great many of them are words which convey thought or feeling more freshly and vividly than the powers of other Anglo-Saxon poets ever compassed."

The chapter on variation is even more impressive. Mr. Brodeur defines variation more narrowly than Paetzel, insisting that the multiple statements of an idea indicate a shift in stress and that variation and parallelism are not necessarily identical. He then discusses at length that central stylistic device of Old English poetry, analyzing in detail several important passages of *Beowulf* to show how the poet, deviating from the common poetic practice of his time, used variation to emphasize and expand his representation of dramatically significant emotions. Not that the poet was above using variation conventionally as simply an ornament of style; but he generally restricted it to lines which report the feelings of the participants in the action of particular scenes and employed it relatively seldom in lines reporting the action itself. Part I, which makes much more extensive use of variation, is drama; Part II is elegy.

In Chapter II, as in Chapter I, the reader may be inclined to disagree with evaluations of specific lines and passages. Moreover, when the author comments that the device of variation in other Old English poems is "too often conventional, flat, and trite," he might have given some illustrations. But the importance of these first two chapters should not be minimized. They should go a long way to dispel the general impression about Old English poetic language and style that has caused even that dean of Old English scholars, Kenneth Sisam, to say in a very recent article on "*Beowulf's* Fight with the Dragon" (RES, n.s., IX, 1958, 129-140): "The likelihood [of inconsistencies in *Beowulf*] is increased by the characteristic imprecision of the language of Old English verse, where general terms are preferred, roughly synonymous expressions are accumulated ,and compounds of vague meaning are freely used."

The next two chapters are revisions and expansions of earlier articles. In "Structure and Unity" Mr. Brodeur maintains that it is through the fourfold mention of Hygelac's defeat in Frisia (the ultimate cause of the decline of both Danes and Geats) and the ever-expressed love between Beowulf and Hygelac that the poet effects a fusion of the fabulous and the historical, of Parts I and II, and links the rise and fall of nations with the Heldenleben of its central character. This is a sensitive interpretation—oversensitive, some may feel, for a poem whose audience was primarily a listening one. Still, it is stimulating and suggestive. In "Design for Terror" the author illuminates the way in which the *Beowulf* poet made original use of suspense and foreshadowing in the three great fights. He builds his case partly through a comparison of the first two fights with their analogues in the *Grettissaga*, partly by internal examination. Although the out-

come of Beowulf's fight with Grendel is anticipated for the audience even before it begins, suspense and terror are worked up and maintained through variation in large narrative units and through the dramatic audience of Danes and Geats, whose emotions and actions during the fight hold the center of the stage. In the fight between Beowulf and Grendel's dam, though the female is represented as weaker than her son (this is traditional), the struggle is more difficult and terrifying because it takes place on the monster's home ground. Furthermore, there is no forecast of victory for Beowulf until he throws the monster off and sees the magic sword; and there is also the secondary suspense in the dramatic audience of Danes and Geats waiting on the bank for the outcome. (Brodeur gives due credit, of course, to Lumiansky's important article on the dramatic audience.) The poet varies his technique yet again in the third fight: he constantly emphasizes the tragic end and concentrates the effects of terror in the triply armed dragon itself. The poet's abandonment of suspense here is justified and aesthetically right, Mr. Brodeur feels, even as the poet of the *Chanson de Roland* had abandoned suspense and let tradition govern his telling of the final catastrophe at Roncevaux.

Again, this is all suggestive and makes one return to the poem with a sharpened appreciation of the poet's art. Armed with Brodeur's perceptions, one observes, for example, in the fight with Grendel's dam, that the poet gained suspense by still another variation. In lines 1441b ff., he first describes how Beowulf arms himself with body armor which knows how to protect him from grievous hurt, then with a helmet that no sword could pierce, and then with Hrunting, lent by Unferth, which had never failed one who used it. The body armor works against the monster's claws as she drags Beowulf down; but then the sword fails for the first time in its history. When Grendel's mother then fells Beowulf and sits astride him to attack him with a knife, surely the poet has produced marvelous suspense: Will the armor hold against the blade as it had against the claws, or will it, like Hrunting, fail?

In "Setting and Action" the author once more uses comparison with Germanic heroic tradition, especially as represented by the *Grettissaga*. He finds the *Beowulf* poet to be original in providing motivation and transition for Beowulf's fights in Denmark and in his use of the settings of Heorot and the Haunted Mere (infinitely richer settings than those in any analogues) "to enhance the effect of the main action and... to suggest something beyond it, something at once magnificent and tragic... at once dramatic and symbolic: they reveal a present splendor and intimate its imminent ruin." This dramatic contrast in Part I is replaced in Part II by the elegiac contrast of present with past, and the rich setting of Part I is replaced by a more traditional setting, appropriately "lean and stark" to suit the more vigorous and almost uninterrupted main action which culminates in the hero's (and eventually his people's) destruction.

Mr. Brodeur next turns his attention to the differences in the use to which the poet puts the heroic legends and the historical traditions with which the poem abounds. The legendary matter, furnishing most of the "episodes" of Part I, is presented in the main allusively and "serves as enrichment or adornment, or affords characterization by way of compliment or contrast, or drives home a specific point." It provides "a sense of perspective, of antiquity." (Its very antiquity, it might be noted, provides further a bridge between the fabulous and the historical in the poem.) The historical material, found mainly in Part II, not only furnishes background and setting for Beowulf's later career, but functions dramatically as part of Beowulf's life. It also differs from the legendary mate-

rial in being related in detail and in being specifically Scandanavian rather than Germanic.

I must pass over the analyses of the Finn Episode and the Unferth Intermezzo for lack of space. But Mr. Brodeur's "brilliant solution" (the phrase is Kemp Malone's) of the problem of tense and of other cruces in the Ingeld Episode call for special mention. Comparing Beowulf's report to Hygelac of the Freawaru-Ingeld match and its consequences with Saxo Grammaticus' account and with the probable Ur-story known to the *Beowulf* poet and his audience, Mr. Brodeur finds that the "acting personnages" in the report are nameless (some old warrior will incite some young Heathobard to vengeance and thus renew the feud), while the story known to the Anglo-Saxons actually had Ingeld being stirred by Starcatherus to avenge his father's death. This anonymity in Beowulf's account reveals the hero's shrewdness and political sagacity while not violating his characterization (and the poet's procedures) by having him be prophetic. This is indeed a "brilliant solution." (Withergyld, it is true, is given as the name of the slain man whose armor a young Dane will be wearing; but Withergyld is not an "acting personnage.") Equally convincing is the author's reasoning for assigning the projected scene of vengeance against the scion of Withergyld's *bana* to the Heathobard rather than the Danish court, despite Kemp Malone's refusal to accept this part of Brodeur's argument.

The chapter on "Christian and Pagan" is largely devoted to reconciling the poet's representation of the Danish court in generally Christian terms and his attribution to Hrothgar of "monotheistic if not specifically Christian" sentiments with his characterization of the Danes in lines 175-188 as heathens and with the following "Christian Excursus." He also, of course, considers the "Christianity" of Beowulf himself. The analysis revolves around an interpretation of that famous crux in lines 168-169:

> no he þone gifstol gretan moste,
> maddum for Metode, ne his myne wisse.

In opposition to majority opinion (including Klaeber's), Brodeur takes the *he* of 168a to refer to Hrothgar rather than to Grendel; so that it is Hrothgar who is prevented from approaching his own throne because he does not know the Lord's favor—because he as well as his Danes, as the poet and his audience well knew, were pagans; and the following lines on their pagan practices are the poet's de facto recognition of this. The Christian Excursus follows naturally as a sympathetic and tragically ironic portrayal of the inherited ignorance of the Danes in their sins, before God in His mercy sent Beowulf to rescue them: a contrast to the damnation which the poet reserves for such miscreants as the race of Grendel. Having established the historic paganism of Hrothgar and his Danes (and in effect of Beowulf himself), the poet then, Brodeur argues, could represent his noble characters in the only way a good mediaeval Christian could, by having them express Christian sentiments. "In spirit, as their words and acts reveal them, they are essentially Christian," and thus vouchsafed God's grace. Beowulf is especially God's champion in his fight against the monsters in Denmark; and, though only the defender of his people in his fight against the "natural" dragon, "his death is a supreme act of self-sacrifice, a very imitation of Christ."

In the chapters thus far considered, it might be argued, Brodeur's exposition of the difference in the amount of variation between Parts I and II of the poem,

of the contrast in setting and in kind of action between Parts I and II, of the difference in prominence of legendary and historical material in the two parts, all indicate a failure of the poet to unify his poem, or even different authors, though Brodeur's arguments in terms of suitability for each part and overall suitability seem eminently right. In these chapters, too, there are minor points with which one may find fault: (1) unfortunate phrasings, e.g., the author apparently attributes the poet's uniqueness among Anglo-Saxon poets to his literacy (p. 5), though mentioning in the next sentences the literacy of other Anglo-Saxon poets; (2) certain awkward moments of exposition, e.g., on pp. 133-136 he seems undecided whether the Ingeld passage is heroic legend or historical tradition, and it is not till p. 136 that he clarifies the point that he wishes to make—that it is both; (3) certain inconsistencies, e.g., on p. 66, in the chapter on variation, he calls Beowulf's long speech (lines 2426-2537) sentimental rather than emotional, attributing to this absence of emotion the thinness of variation in the speech, but in the chapter on structure and unity, on p. 85, he writes: "this speech [i.e., the part of the monologue recalling his relations with Hygelac] is the strongest expression of human feeling in the whole poem; its climax is Beowulf's passionate resolve (lines 2497 ff.) to be worthy, in his last fight, of his beloved Hygelac."

It would be ungrateful, however, to dwell on such minutiae. For the final chapter, "Anticipation, Contrast, and Irony," fuses, with admirable clarity and a renewed emphasis on the unity of the poem, the critical perceptions of the earlier chapters. All of us are forever indebted to Professor Brodeur for this *magnum opus*.

STANLEY B. GREENFIELD

University of Oregon

VAN PASCHA TOT NOAH. EEN VERKENNING VAN VONDELS DRAMA'S NAAR CONTINUITEIT EN ONTWIKKELING IN HUN GRONDMOTIEF EN STRUCTUUR. By W. A. P. Smit. Zwolle: W. E. J. Tjeenk Willink, 1956. Part I. 519 p. (Zwolse reeks van taal- en letterkundige studies 5 A.)

If any name in the history of Dutch literature is known to the nonspecialist, it is that of Vondel, the seventeenth-century Dutch dramatist. He is the greatest poet of the Golden Age in his own country and a key figure in the literary development of Western Europe, and has been the subject of a large number of biographical, critical, and comparative studies.

W. A. P. Smit, professor of Dutch literature at the University of Utrecht, has made an outstanding contribution to the understanding of Vondel, which will be of compelling interest not only to Vondel scholars but to comparatists in the seventeenth-century field. In Vondel's dramas we see the movements of the literary currents that flow through the Renaissance and baroque literatures of Europe. Vondel was influenced by the Greek and Roman writers, by the French, and by the Italians, and in turn he influenced the greatest English writer and the greatest German writer of his age, Milton and Gryphius.

As the subtitle indicates, *Van Pascha tot Noah* is "an examination of Vondel's dramas for continuity and development in their basic motifs and structure." Part I, which is reviewed here, covers the years 1610-48 in Vondel's development. Professor Smit sees four turning points in Vondel's career, so that his literary life may be divided into five periods. The first period is 1610-20, or from *Pascha*

to *Hierusalem*; the second 1620-40, or from *Palamedes*, which is defined as an intermezzo, to *Maeghden*; the third is 1640-48, or from *Gebroeders* to *Leeuwendalers*, another intermezzo; the fourth, 1648-60, or from *Salomon* to *Jeptha*; and the fifth, 1660-67, or from *Koning Edipus* to *Noah*. Thus the translations that Vondel made from Euripides and Sophocles in 1668 do not, in Professor Smit's view, have any real connection with the dramas of the fifth period.

Part I considers the first three periods of Vondel's development. Professor Smit, who is an authority on Dutch literature of the seventeenth century and a leading Dutch comparatist, is able to present Vondel's dramas in the historical perspective that is essential for any understanding of the literature of the past. He shows that it is *not* true that Vondel began by writing clumsy classical dramas and then slowly remedied his deficiencies. Except for *Pascha* and *Leeuwendalers*, Vondel was always interested in the writing of classical tragedy. But the concept of "classical tragedy" was still more or less in a state of flux in the first half of the seventeenth century. Both Hooft and Vondel have been misinterpreted because it has not been kept in mind that the requirements for a classical tragedy in the first decades of the century were quite different from what they became thirty or forty years later. Vondel followed the theoretical concept of tragedy defined by Scaliger, Heinsius, Grotius, and Vossius. Smit illustrates the changing definition of tragedy in the seventeenth century by analyzing Vondel's use of the *exitus felix*.

Viewing Vondel's work in its historical perspective again, Smit points out that things that might not suggest themselves to us were perfectly clear to Vondel's audience. Thus, he calls *Pascha* an emblematic play, in which the characters are not important in themselves but only for their roles in illustrating the universal idea behind the story. We have no right to expect psychological depth as we understand it. Smit also rejects the biographical interpretation of Vondel's dramas, favored by Sterck, Molkenboer, and others, since the Renaissance poet was disinclined to write about himself and tragedy was required to be universal.

Comparatists will be pleased to note that Professor Smit considers Vondel as a Renaissance poet as well as a Dutch dramatist. In his discussion of *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, for example, the author points out that Vondel, in his dedication to Grotius, recognized the fact that the poets of his century, Tasso, Ronsard, and Hooft, followed the classical example of selecting themes from their national history. At the same time, he was captivated by Virgil's *Aeneid*, and it was the second book of the *Aeneid*, Smit holds, rather than the influence of Seneca, that mainly determined the structure of the play. Smit then goes on to trace the shift in Vondel's admiration from Seneca to Sophocles and the Greek tragedians, under the influence of his humanist friends. The attitude of Vondel's heroine in *Maeghden* (1639) parallels that of Electra in Sophocles' play, and Smit believes that Vondel intended his *Gebroeders* (1640) as a Christian equivalent of the same Greek drama. Similarly he made the hero of *Joseph in Egypten* (1640) a Christian Hippolytus, following the external details of Seneca's *Phaedra* in order to emphasize the essential difference between the two dramas. Smit denies te Winkel's claim that Vondel depended on Tonnis in this play, for Vondel had come upon a new problem. He saw his two leading characters as the representatives of two opposing worlds, Judaism (as the forerunner of Christianity) and heathenism, or, ultimately, God and Satan.

Both *Peter en Pauwels* and *Maria Stuart* suffered from Vondel's conception of the drama as an epic, and Smit notes a great resemblance and even parallelism between them. He also observes that Vondel was conscious of his errors as a

dramatist in *Maria Stuart*, for it was at this time that Vondel came into contact with Aristotle's rule for character, but the play was already finished or almost finished. Vondel also acquired a knowledge of Aristotle's concepts of terror and pity. Probably through conversations with Vossius, he arrived at a new insight into tragedy; by 1646 he had come to a decisive turning point in his development as a dramatist. Thus Smit sees *Salomon* (1648) as marking a new idea of the drama and a new period in Vondel's life, leading directly to *Lucifer*.

Wellekens' claim that Vondel created a new genre in *Leeuwendalers* was wrong, however; for Vondel considered the pastoral an intermediate form between tragedy and comedy. His original contribution was the combination of the precious Petrarchan language of the Italian pastoral with the rough rural speech of Virgil's *Bucolica*.

Professor Smit's scholarship and his skill as a comparatist make this an invaluable book. In his discussion of *Leeuwendalers*, for example, he considers the ideas of *agnitio* and *peripeteia*, which come from Aristotle's *Poetics*. In explaining how Vondel became aware of these ideas, Smit reminds us that van Hamel has established the fact that they do not appear in the work of any of the Dutch poets of the first part of the seventeenth century. Heinsius had discussed them in his *De Tragoediae Constitutione*, but in practice Dutch dramatists were much more inclined to look for guidance in Horace's *Ars Poetica* than in the writings of Aristotle and his commentators. It was the influence of Vossius that wrought the change. Professor Smit then goes on to consider the influence of Plautus and Terence, Guarini, and Tasso.

No one with a serious interest in the seventeenth-century Dutch drama will want to be without this book. The excellence of the first volume leaves the reader waiting impatiently for the next two parts.

SEYMOUR L. FLAXMAN

New York University

DANTE STUDIES 2. By Charles S. Singleton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University. Press, 1958. vi, 291 p.

Professor Singleton's important study is closely reasoned from a mass of evidential data. Therefore it may be useful at the outset to state his argument in summary fashion without the supporting texts and details of presentation which necessarily form a large part of his exposition.

Dante's literal journey stands for the *itinerarium mentis ad Deum* of any Christian chosen by God to make it, and Dante's terminus, standing in God's presence in the flesh, corresponds to the mind's direct vision of God in this life. The *itinerarium* is accomplished in three stages by a cooperation of intellect and will, and these stages are represented by Dante's three guides: Virgil, Beatrice, Bernard. Virgil and Beatrice are, and Bernard presides over, respectively, one of the three lights of the intellect: natural light, the light of grace, and the light of glory. The guides correlate also with three conversions of the will: its disposition to a state of justice, the reception of sanctifying grace, and the reception of consummate grace. The areas over which the guides have jurisdiction correspond to modes of being natural respectively to men, angels, God. Hence, when the journey with Beatrice begins, the first canto of the *Paradiso* marks with the verb trasumanare and the reference to Glaucus the passage to a state supernatural to man.

The portion under Virgil's guidance represents justification, that is, the mind's turning from sinful disorder to a condition in which the passions are subject to reason. Justification precedes and is a preparation for grace, and in scholastic terms may be described as a process of matter up to the moment when the form of grace is imposed upon it. In his passing to Beatrice, Dante's just disposition is placed in proper relation to God, and this perfects justice in a way beyond the ken of Virgil. The advent of grace into the mind is the coming of Christ into it, and, since Beatrice represents grace, her coming to Dante is analogously His coming which takes place whenever a soul attains grace. Her coming is surrounded also by signs of His original advent in the flesh and His future advent as judge of the world. The reference to the first advent reinforces the Roman role of Virgil: as he brings Dante to justice and then Beatrice comes, so Rome brought mankind to justice and then Christ came. The summit of the mountain where this occurs signifies the happiness of passing from the perfection of the active life (forefigured by the dream of Leah) to the contemplative life represented by Beatrice, one of whose "other" names is Contemplation. Still other names for her are Philosophy, as pagan Virgil sees her, mistress of the acquired virtues, and Wisdom (specifically created Wisdom), as Christian Dante sees her, attended by the infused moral virtues as well as the theological ones.

Thus far Professor Singleton has been considering the journey up the slopes of Purgatory as a "Journey to Beatrice." He next considers the same journey as a "Return to Eden." From the foot of the mountain Dante notices four stars "never seen except by the first people" and utters the lament, "Oh northern widowed clime since thou art deprived of seeing them." These stars represent the infused cardinal virtues, which are also represented by the four maidens who come at the left wheel of Beatrice's chariot and declare, "Here we are nymphs and in the sky we are stars." Although, at a different moment, Dante saw three other stars over Purgatory, he uttered no lament over them, and the three maidens who come at the right wheel of the chariot (both triads being symbolic of the theological virtues) say nothing about being stars. In Eden as represented by Dante there are two rivers instead of the four named by Genesis; the fathers interpreted the four as symbols of the cardinal virtues; Dante has simply changed the rivers into stars. The fourth virtue, however symbolized, is justice, which was defined by pagan philosophers as the ordering of the passions to the reason. The scholastics defined it as a triple ordering: the body to the soul, the passions to the reason, the intellect to God. As Genesis contains the story of a first people, so the pagans had a myth of a first Golden Age when the goddess Astraea, also known as Virgo, lived among men. She was taken to be an allegory of justice, and Virgil's reference to her in the fourth eclogue was so understood (note *Purg.*, XXII, 70-72). The justice which she represented was, for the Christian exegetes, specifically the justice of the "first people," Adam and Eve, before the fall, a condition they called natural justice because it belonged to man's nature and was therefore different from the personal justice attainable by an individual through Christ. Personal justice, like natural, orders the intellect to God, but even after its attainment the passions continue to trouble the rule of reason, and the body remains subject to death. It is strikingly in the central area, the ordering of the passions, that the two justices differ. This is why Dante's lament is uttered for the four stars; they represent natural justice unattainable after the fall. In this they are Matelda's stars, for she, too, is the embodying figure of natural justice, hence desired but not possessed by Dante. The difference between the

acquired virtues known to pagans and the infused virtues known to Christians is marked by the stream of Lethe beyond which Virgil may not pass, and which Dante passes only to receive sanctifying grace.

Professor Singleton says that the doctrines of Dante's allegory thus interpreted were "explicit in the theology of his day" (p. vi) and constituted "a public and established thing, a truth shared generally by Christians (p. 8), and were so present to "the readers of Dante's time" that by "*evocation*: he calls the familiar to mind" (p. 8). Professor Singleton seems to be constructing something of a dilemma for himself. It happens that a certain number of Christian readers of Dante's time, rather more learned than the average, committed to writing their explanations of the *Commedia's* allegory. On Professor Singleton's showing, anything he has to tell us will either be found in the earlier books or it will not belong to the stock of familiar ideas which Dante could "confidently" (p. 8) count on evoking. Similarly, one would expect what is explicit in Catholic theology to be found in the works of modern commentators versed in the history of doctrine, Gilson, for example. These problems are perhaps special instances of the question which confronts any explicator: If the present interpretation is both right and new, is the poem not obscure, since good and experienced readers of the past have failed to see this meaning? And how is it that they, having missed the meaning, have still been deeply affected by the poem?

In Professor Singleton's case the answer is that the main outlines of the reading are traditional, but he has given focus and coherence to what was blurred and scattered. This is a greater achievement than may appear from the bald statement of it. For example, the general notion of the relationship among the guides is to be found in Flamini's *Study of the Divine Comedy* (tr. Josselyn, 1910) under the rubric "Justification and glorification," where he says *inter alia*: "What is the symbolism of the fatiguing path from the 'country' at the foot of the mountain (whose meaning we know) to the 'holy country' on its summit, that is, to the state of felicity consisting in the activity of one's own virtue? It symbolizes *justification*—the movement of the soul to the attainment of the state of righteousness (*justitia*)—in its successive stages, that of the *preparation for justifying grace* ... Finally, as the steep of the 'holy mountain' represents *justification* in its various steps ... the nine concentric heavens which are contained within the Empyrean, represent *glorification* in its various steps, which leads to the *state of felicity consisting in the fruition of the 'divine aspect'* ... in the knowledge of which the *habit of contemplation* (St. Bernard, The 'Contemplator') makes us advance." But one would look in vain through Flamini's pages for the precise application of this doctrine to the concrete details of the *Purgatorio* which Professor Singleton provides,and Flamini's areas of meaning tend to be fuzzy around the border, whereas Singleton's are precisely defined and nicely articulated. After all, the general doctrine was known as early as Romans 8:30: "And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified." What is wanted is a demonstration of how the specific details of Dante's narrative relate to the Pauline scheme, and Singleton's precision is of quite another order from Flamini's looseness. There can be no doubt that his work is the most solid and central study of the *Commedia* which has been undertaken in English of recent years, and because it is by a single hand it is more coherent than studies like the *Letture dantesche* (see especially vol. II, *Purgatorio*, Florence, 1958), which present the work of eminent scholars but confine the attention of each to a canto.

The work is still in progress; the present volume is the second of a series, and in a sense all reviews of the installments are provisional. Certain large questions of judgment and strategy will remain open until the author has disclosed his full plan. For example, the distinction between allegory and symbolism, which he has taken over from Coleridge via C. S. Lewis, seems not only opposed to Dante's own prescription but to have been thus far a hindrance to exposition. Only when publication is complete will we know whether, starting from this divisive position, Singleton will lead us to an organic *Commedia* in which tropes function purposefully within the larger fictional scheme. There is every reason to hope that he will; and that, since the most telling feature of his explication is the way it makes one part of the poem's symbolism reinforce another, when all the interlockings are in place, his reading will reveal a cogency perfecting the pattern only to be glimpsed in the opening installments.

It is well known that Dantists are prepared to dispute *ad infinitum* about any given verse of the poem, and Professor Singleton's book is bound to raise a number of these local issues. One set of issues will occur where the allegorical interpretation is based on the analogy of number; for in these cases there are usually several doctrinal points related to the number, and the interpreter must make a choice among established traditions. Thus Professor Singleton argues that the four stars seen over Eden represent the cardinal virtues; but, since the four rivers of Eden (absent from the *Commedia*) represented these virtues in scriptural exegesis, "we are brought to face the fact that Dante has simply changed those rivers of Genesis into stars" (p. 177). There was an established tradition, from which Professor Singleton cites examples, equating the rivers with the virtues, but there was an equally established tradition, of which he makes no mention, equating them with the four evangelists. In the course of his argument for the river-star substitution, Professor Singleton (pp. 226-227) describes the benediction of the water to be used for baptism: the bishop "first makes the sign of the cross above it, then dividing it into four he sprinkles it towards the four cardinal points in memory of the four rivers of the terrestrial Paradise." His comment is: "Thus in the context of this whole cluster of associations at the Easter moment, thought of the four rivers is also relevant. And turning back to Dante's staging of that moment in the poem, we remember of course that he too has provided for this, turning to four stars instead of four rivers. And we know now on what principle Dante had transformed rivers into stars, keeping the meaning that had long before been established for the rivers, the four cardinal virtues." But, in this service, dividing the water and casting it to the four corners of the earth is not symbolic of the virtues; it signifies the baptizing of all the nations. The related blessing of the font, which forms part of the service of Holy Saturday, makes this explicit in the part beginning, "Qui te de paradisis fonte..."

In a sense the allegation that Dante changed rivers into stars is an assertion about the genesis of this part of the poem, about its source and the poet's intention. Another set of local issues will collect around these inquiries. For example, Chapter IX argues that Dante placed Eden opposite Jerusalem because the Versio Antiqua reads "et ejecit Adam, et collocavit eum contra paradisum voluptatis..." where the Vulgate has "Ejecitque Adam, et collocavit ante paradisum voluptatis Cherubim..." There are several problems. Would Dante have taken *contra* to mean "diametrically opposite" rather than "over against"? Besides the usage elsewhere in Genesis, e.g., 12:8, where the Versio Antiqua has "Et recessit inde in montem contra orientem Bethel... corresponding to the Vulgate's "Et inde

transgrediens ad montem, qui erat contra orientem Bethel...," one thinks of Joshua 15:8, "Ad verticem montis qui est contra Geennom...," Deut. 11:30, "Habitat in campestribus contra Galgalam...," and the so-often repeated phrase of Numbers, "super Jordanem contra Jericho." One might consider also Augustine's "Et ejectus foras de paradiso, moratus est contra paradisum voluptatis..." as falling naturally within that meaning. Would the simple *contra* give rise to the complex story (*Inf.*, XXXIV) of the rushing away of land under the sea and the heaping up of the mountain at Satan's fall? Or the collocation of Eden with Purgatory? What of the tradition that the skull of Adam was brought to Golgotha by Melchisedec, which implies that Adam lived and died elsewhere?

A third set of local issues will gather round specific details of text or correlated doctrine. One example of each will suffice. It is essential to Singleton's argument that Dante lament only four stars, although he invented seven, divided to shine in alternate groups by day and night. The lines immediately following the lament are: "Com'io da loro sguardo fui partito, / Un poco me volgendo a l'altro polo, / Là onde il carro già era sparito..." If Dante wishes to impress the number four, why does he turn to the constellation of seven stars (the Carro, the Big Dipper), which is the counterpart in the northern hemisphere of the seven in the southern? It is this sort of textual detail which one expects Singleton to bring within his treatment before he concludes it. There is a further problem of exactitude in the equation of stars never seen with virtues never regained, since, as Professor Singleton points out (p. 147), Dante and the souls in Purgatory do see the stars but do not regain the virtues. Should not exceptions to the letter be reflected in the allegory? An example of the kind of problem which will arise over details of doctrine is the division of the mountain top by Lethe into an outer part accessible to Virgil, corresponding to the first moment of Adam's creation *in naturalibus solis*, and an inner Eden from which Virgil is barred, corresponding to a second moment when Adam received grace. The speech of Statius (*Purg.*, XXV, 67-72) is quoted and then Professor Singleton says (p. 280): "In the formation of every human creature, two moments or phases are made distinct by an emphatic line: first, there is the phase of nature, a moment of formation *in naturalibus* (and just so far Virgil could have carried the argument), followed by the moment 'above nature' when God, happy (and almost proud!) of nature's handiwork within her own order, completes the genesis and full formation of the creature to be fashioned, by breathing in, infusing, the rational soul. It is a moment 'above nature,' the moment of grace." But not in any sense in which Professor Singleton has used the word grace elsewhere in his book. The analogy is not with the conferring of grace on Adam but with the breathing into his nostrils of the breath of life, which, in the tradition being used by Singleton, occurred outside the boundary of Eden.

While these various local issues will provide matter for discussion among specialists, they in no way impair the usefulness of Singleton's study, and it may well be that they will be resolved in future installments of his work. It has seemed worth while to raise them simply because his book is so important; no discussion of the *Commedia* hereafter can avoid taking it into account. Professor Singleton's study "is aimed at bringing into view the main outline of allegory in the *Comedy*" (p. v). He has succeeded splendidly.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

Wesleyan University

ROMAIN ROLLAND. By Teresa Di Scanno. Parma: Guanda, 1957. 306 p.

This study of Romain Rolland, the man and his works, is intended for the general reader. The author has rewritten a thesis which was accepted at the Istituto Universitario di Magistero di Genoa in 1955. In her introduction, Miss Di Scanno reveals an attitude which informs the entire study, and which accounts perhaps both for its virtues and its defects. Impressed by Rolland's idea (or ideal) of universal unity, a mystic ideal, she approaches her subject with an almost religious veneration.

"Così in questo incontro col Rolland ho cercato di avvicinare con occhi vigili e con cuore puro, lo scrittore, il creatore di eroi, non trionfatori, ma sovente vinti, amanti della vita, pronti a soffrire per una ideale religione universale, per il Dio Vivente" (p. 9).

From these pages there emerges a rather vivid portrait of an earnest, highly idealistic, courageous, and solitary man, living almost entirely in the realm of the intellect, if not (and decidedly not) in an ivory tower. The portrait is true, as far as it goes. Miss Di Scanno is to be congratulated for bringing him so vividly before the reader. However, the Rolland who appears before us is, by and large, the somewhat conventionally accepted Rolland we have become accustomed to in most of his biographies. In spite of the wealth of new and unpublished material available to her, Miss Di Scanno has not added much to a deeper understanding of the man, or to a reinterpretation of his life or his works. This was not, I presume, her purpose. There is more, however, to his life than she has been willing to give us. Her portrait is limited to certain sides of the man and his character, but is not yet the whole man. Various conflicting sides are neglected, perhaps from lack of awareness of them, perhaps from choice and necessity—monumental biographies need monumental subjects and great biographers. Rolland the man was plagued by some extraordinary problems, both in his own character and in his environment. He had to face and overcome certain weaknesses, and a closer acquaintance with the man in his struggles and failures as well as in his triumphs would have brought the reader closer to him and afforded fresh insight into his works.

The first part of the volume (pp. 1-140) is devoted to Rolland's life and general spiritual development. The second part, "I cicli creativi," is devoted to the works, both the published and the unpublished youthful writings. In the first chapter, "Infanzia (1866-1880)," a summary but adequate account of his forebears, his immediate family, his birthplace, the temperaments of his parents and their families is related to the future man. In "Adolescenza (1880-1886)," the fact that the choice of studies in Paris was not so much Rolland's as his family's, especially his mother's, is important, and the biographer might have pursued further the question of the domination of Mme Rolland. After the removal to Paris, the effects of the intellectual, moral, and physical atmosphere of the city on the rather frail, sensitive, and solitary young student are well portrayed with the help of abundant quotations from Rolland's memoirs, published and unpublished.

One of the very important early influences on Rolland's life was the revelation of nature through the emotional impact of the mountains, during a summer trip in Dauphiné, especially at Ferney. The impact was such that he expressed the force of his new feelings in very sensuous images of creation and procreation. Miss Di Scanno feels and interprets this response very sensitively. She also

portrays rather vividly his meditative nature, his need for a guiding personal philosophy, and the resulting "Credo quia verum," which was finally published, after his death, in an appendix to the volume of his memoirs, *Le Cloître de la rue d'Ulm.*

In "Primavera romana (1886-1889)," Miss Di Scanno emphasizes correctly the sadness at the separation of the young man from his mother, but does not see, or at any rate reveal, his relief at a temporary separation from her dominating personality. Of the various benefits of his stay in Rome, one of the greatest was perhaps his acquaintance with Malwida von Meysenbug, an elderly German woman. However, it seems to me that Miss Di Scanno exaggerates the importance of this friendship in introducing Rolland to the great Germany of the past. Rolland was acquainted with German literature before his meeting with Malwida—to whom he paid his first visit in Rome, December 12 or 13, 1889. On September 11, 1890, the following year, he wrote to her: "Au fond, je ne dis tant de mal de Goethe que parce que c'est un des êtres qui ont toujours exercé sur moi la plus puissante fascination (demandez à Suarès...)..." The parenthetical remark shows beyond a doubt that his reading of Goethe goes back to his days at the École Normale (1886-89). Two months later (November 13, 1890) he wrote to his mother:

"Dans mes récréations, je lis une étude sur les poésies lyriques de Goethe, avec nombre d'extraits. Comme j'ai de la peine à avaler cet homme-là! On n'est pas plus antipathique. D'autre part, les lettres de Melle de M[eysenbug] me répètent: 'Quand nous serons à Rome, nous lirons du Goethe ; vous verrez comme il est beau.' J'avoue que j'y tiens médiocrement. Ce sensualisme froid, cet égoïsme artistique, cette nature pondérée, machine à écrire esthétiquement ses sentiments et ses sensations, ne sont pas de mon goût. Une seule chose m'a toujours fasciné en lui, la puissance de volonté sur lui-même; mais à la condition de ne pas étouffer la spontanéité de l'âme et l'éclat des passions.—Puis, j'avoue peu chercher les poètes purement poètes, les lyriques."

These are the remarks of a man who has long been familiar with some parts at least of German literature. He had written to Malwida earlier (September 11, 1890) that, much to his own regret, he could not judge Goethe objectively: "Il fut trop artiste dans la vie et dans l'art." Rolland claimed to prefer those who kept art for art and life for life. In 1893 (December 23) he wrote a long critique of Schiller's *Wallenstein* in a letter to Malwida, in which he says: "...voici des années que je réserve mon jugement sur Schiller." The remark may place his first reading of the German writer as early as—if not before—his first meeting with Malwida.

The chapter entitled 'Sotto il segno di Cristoforo" (pp. 68-78) includes an account of Rolland's 1910 accident, when he was struck by a car while crossing the Avenue des Champs-Élysées. Miss Di Scanno tends to exaggerate its seriousness: "Ritornato quasi miracolosamente alla vita..." (p. 73). The injuries, serious enough it is true, included, besides contusions and shock, a fracture of the left arm and a dislocation of one leg. On November 2 (about a week after the accident), Rolland wrote to Jean-Richard Bloch that "Je suis encore assez faible...toujours un peu de fièvre..." He spent a great deal of time in bed during the following three months, but it may be doubted that his injuries kept him in an "immobilità che per molti mesi, di giorno e di notte, come un bambino in fasce, lo aveva confidato alle tenerissime cure materne..." (p. 74), when we read in a letter to J.-R. Bloch, November 17, 1910 (unpublished), three weeks

after the accident, that he was beginning to walk. The biographer reveals at times a slightly naive attitude of hero worship. Certainly, a high degree of sympathy is necessary in order to penetrate far enough into the life, loves, and works of a man to write his biography. However, critical judgment should not be abandoned, even partially. Heroes with feet of clay are more appealing—and more understandable—than a nonexistent perfection.

Among the points in this biography open to criticism are various errors in dates. Rolland worked at the Agence Internationale des Prisonniers de Guerre of the Red Cross at Geneva from October 5, 1914 until June 1915, not until June 1916, as appears on p. 83. The date of his mother's death is erroneously given twice (pp. 97, 98) as May 19, 1918 instead of May 19, 1919. In June 1935 Rolland made at last the long-desired trip to Moscow. He left Villeneuve on June 17 (unpublished letter to Alphonse de Châteaubriant, Sunday, June 16, 1935), and so could not have reached Moscow on June 16 (p. 122).

The chapter on the war years, although short, is remarkably well done. But it would have been fairer for Gerhardt Hauptmann if Miss Di Scanno had pointed out the part played by irresponsible and chauvinistic journalism in the apparent misunderstanding between the French and German writers. Hauptmann did reply to Rolland's letter, but the reply was published in a distorted form.

The chapter on India and Russia is one of the central chapters of the book, reflecting Miss Di Scanno's almost religious attitude towards Rolland. Her statement that Rolland had been attracted by Asiatic thought from his early adolescence is open to some question. There seems now to be little evidence that he knew anything about Asiatic thought before his days at the École Normale. Her affirmation that it was during the war, as early as 1915, that the mysterious relationship between his thinking and Oriental thought became evident to him is probably true; the reader might wish that some of the evidence for the statement were quoted (p. 104).

In the second part of the volume, Miss Di Scanno first discusses briefly, but adequately considering their slight importance, the early, unpublished plays. She believes "Le Siège de Mantoue" to be the best of these plays. It comes nearer, she says, to expressing true feelings of real life than any of his other early attempts. It is noteworthy, as she points out, that the plots and atmosphere of these plays are probably those of Paris during the Franco-Prussian War and the siege of Paris. Although Rolland was only four or five years old at the time, he was not too young to have felt something of the turbulence and emotions of the war years.

Her appraisal of the first published plays is in general very good, although there appears to be a contradiction in her view of Aërt. On p. 151 she says: "Il protagonista è simile ad un piccolo Amlete, esitante e tormentato." Yet, "Aërt non è un personaggio vivo, fatto di carne, ma puro simbolo dell'azione eroica, che esige la vittoria dello spirito." Both statements need qualification, since the symbol of heroic action cannot be a lesser Hamlet, hesitant and tormented. If he is comparable to Hamlet, he must be living—but Hamlet is not a symbol or example of heroic action. There are perhaps elements of both in Aërt.

As for her conjecture that the Leonids (in the title of the play written in 1928, *Les Léonides*) are for Rolland a symbol representing the pettiness of human struggle in relation to the universe, one conjecture is as good as another. The Leonids, a shower of shooting stars which appears to emanate from the center of the constellation of Leo, is visible during the nights of November 11 to 13; the display was particularly rich in 1799, 1833, and 1866. The principal concentration

meets the earth's orbit every thirty-three years, and this permitted the calculation of the principal axis of their orbit. This computation, carried out by a French astronomer, disclosed the fact that the same route was followed by a comet discovered in 1863. Thus the Leonids are thought to be the last stage of disintegration of a comet. Since the play itself is concerned with the final steps in the distintegration of a society (the Ancien Régime) in a country where the citizens feel that their benefits radiate over all Europe, one would expect that any symbolism in the the title would lie more in this direction. It should be noted that in an unpublished letter to Mme Louise Cruppi, July 14, 1910, Rolland insisted on the importance for literature, for writers, for everyone, of the study of astronomy: "L'astronomie devrait être une des assises de l'esprit."

For a complete picture of Rolland and his ideas, there should have been some mention of a motion-picture scenario, *La Révolte des machines* (first published in English, *Revolt of the Machines; or Invention Run Wild*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1932; in French, Paris, 1948). Miss Di Scanno does not have the title in her bibliography. This Wellsian fantasy has its place besides *Liluli* as a satire of certain aspects of our contemporary civilization.

The remarks about *Jean-Christophe* are good, and Miss Di Scanno is well advised in discussing the novel—which she calls a symphonic poem—from the point of view of its musical construction. Rolland himself insisted on the musical nature of his creative processes. However, to describe a work of art in one medium in terms applicable to another medium is somewhat risky, however valuable the effort. Miss Di Scanno's description of the first books as the andante, of the second books as the scherzo, and of the third as the adagio, is well taken. But to call the last books, especially the *Buisson ardent*, an allegro seems to disregard the differences between the ninth and tenth volumes, *Le Buisson ardent* and *La nouvelle journée*. These volumes are characterized as a movement "... con la tempesta che si avvicina e poi scoppia in passione, in agitazione drammatica che conduce gli eroi all'orlo dell'abisso, alla disperazione." The heaviness and concentrated passion do not seem to be well described by the notation allegro. The finale in *La nouvelle journée*, in which the discords are harmonized, is informed with an atmosphere more in consonance with the term allegro than that of the previous volume.

Miss Di Scanno seriously misplaces the emphasis when she says that the *Le Buisson ardent* treats of the social problem and the difficulty of resolving it. The May Day street brawl, in which Christophe kills and Olivier is fatally injured, is principally the motivating incident of the following series of events, and is the next step in the development of Christophe's character and personality. It exists rather for this purpose than for its own importance. It is true that there are some rather vague discussions of socialism and references to the social movements of the time, but neither they nor the movements are essential themes. They are, however, the subjects of the later novel, *L'Ame enchantée*.

We would like also to modify somewhat Miss Di Scanno's statement made concerning the love affairs of Anna Braun and Christophe in *Le Buisson ardent*. The affair is described as the struggle of the spirit against the power of evil. The description of Anna (p. 245) "in apparenza fredda, ma tragicamente posseduta dal demone della lussuria," is, it is true, apt, and supports the contention. However, Miss Di Scanno herself recalls Tolstoy's *Kreuzer Sonata* in this connection, and, unless music is an evil power, the struggle seems to be rather between the flesh and the spirit. And, for Rolland throughout this novel and the

Ame enchantée, the flesh is not sin. The same force which unleashes the waves of passion in Anna (and consequently in Christophe) restores him to a stable equilibrium, namely, music and musical creation.

In her discussion of *L'Ame enchantée*, Miss Di Scanno insists on the part played by poverty in the development of Annette Rivière, stating, quite correctly, that poverty was for Annette what exile was for Christophe. She might well have added the factor of illegitimate maternity, for such motherhood, in the society of her time, was a line of demarcation as sharp and insurmountable as the national boundaries were for Christophe.

These criticisms of detail and rectifications of minor errors and erroneous emphasis are not to be taken as condemnation of the book. The work is truly valuable for a reader to whom Rolland is not well known. Those who are better acquainted with the French writer will find illuminating discussions amidst a wealth of familiar material, but may perhaps feel the lack of deep penetration into either the man or his works. Miss Di Scanno has written a book for a series that appears to be directed to the cultured, intelligent lay reader, and for such readers the book amply fulfills the author's and the series' intentions.

WILLIAM T. STARR

Northwestern University

THE BROKEN COMPASS: A STUDY OF THE MAJOR COMEDIES OF BEN JONSON. By Edward B. Partridge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. 254 p.

In *The Broken Compass* Professor Partridge analyzes the imagery of Ben Jonson's comedies. He devotes separate chapters to *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, and *Epicoene* and another chapter to three later plays, *The Staple of News*, *The New Inn*, and *The Magnetic Lady*. Two chapters at the end present the general conclusions which emerge from the analysis. Both a bibliography and an index are included.

Readers of *Comparative Literature* may be particularly interested in the preface and the earlier chapters, where Partridge defines his terms and discusses the function of metaphor in literature. He makes no claim that a study of the imagery will solve all the critical problems in Jonson's comedies. In his preface he points out the limitations inherent in studies of imagery and states that such studies must always "... cooperate with studies of other elements in the play—plot, ethos, rhetoric, verse, spectacle, and other kinds of diction" (p. 17). He particularly criticizes those who, like Caroline Spurgeon and Edmund Wilson, claim to discover things about the personality of the writer by examining his imagery.

After defining imagery, for his own purposes, as "metaphoric language," Partridge goes on to reject systems of image classification and, adopting I. A. Richards' terminology, to insist that the only important relationships involving the image are those of tenor to vehicle and of tenor and vehicle together to the context, both the immediate context and the broader context of the entire work. The functions of metaphoric language are summarized on pp. 48-49 with brief discussions of the views of various critics. The functions most relevant to Jonson's plays appear to be the following: (1) the imagery keeps diverse concepts in a state of tension, (2) the author's emphasis on a particular image or kind of image gives tonal unification, and (3) through imagery the author presents the standards by which the reader should judge the characters. Partridge shows that Jonson's

attitude towards metaphor was much like his attitude towards other linguistic matters—the writer should use metaphors but not extravagantly. Above all, in drama he must observe decorum; that is, the language should suit the character who uses it.

The analyses of the plays are excellent. Partridge begins by pointing out that Jonson, like other satirists, constantly focuses his reader's attention on the discrepancies between the ideals which man proclaims and the corruption of these ideals which he actually practises. Thus in *Volpone* Jonson satirizes the lust for money by making gold an object of worship, a worship which is expressed in Christian terms. The debasing of Christian and classical imagery emphasizes the perversion of values in the world of Volpone, which, of course, caricatures a similar perversion in our world. Similarly Partridge shows how in *The Alchemist* religious imagery pervades many of the alchemical discussions. In both plays love is debased, in *Volpone* to the level of an erotic spectacle on a par with the performance of Volpone's dwarf, eunuch, and hermaphrodite, and in *The Alchemist* to a lure for business. In both plays animal imagery is prevalent and suggests the moral level of the human actors. *Epicoene* is concerned with deviations from the normal. The roles of the sexes are confused and interchanged; most of the characters are epicene, i.e., hermaphroditic. Partridge suggests that the weaknesses of the later plays result from the limitations which Jonson imposed upon himself (unlike Shakespeare, he was unwilling to strike out on new paths) and from his inability or unwillingness to invent new imagery. The lack of new imagery reflects the lack of new plots and new characters. Another weakness is the partial return to the allegorical method of *Cynthia's Revels* with Lady Pecunia in *The Staple of News* and Lady Loadstone in *The Magnetic Lady*.

The analyses of the plays are so fine that the reader is chagrined to find no extended discussion of *Bartholomew Fair*. This play differs in structure from the other major plays discussed by Partridge, but this would appear to be all the more reason for an analysis of the imagery. Other faults are minor and also mainly sins of omission. Partridge might have referred to Helge Kökeritz' *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* for further evidence on slang words. For example on pp. 136-137 he does not mention the probable slang meaning of the word "stone" (testicle) in the two passages quoted from *The Alchemist*, though, as his own analysis shows, the imagery of both passages is sexual. The slang sense of "stone" is given in Kökeritz, p. 133, and in Eric Partridge's *Shakespeare's Bawdy*, pp. 195-196. Other words that Partridge should have checked in Kökeritz are "stale" (p. 103) and "firk" (p. 147). Partridge is wrong in giving the sense "stalking horse" for "stale," which was a cant term for "a prostitute of the lowest class employed as a decoy by thieves" (*OED*). He also fails to mention the name Mosca in his discussion on pp. 83-86 of the animal names in *Volpone*.

These are minor faults, however, in an excellent and lively book. Through his study of the imagery, Partridge makes us more sharply aware of the thematic and tonal unity of Jonsonian comedy. The analysis of imagery also reveals an inversion of values in the worlds of Volpone and Subtle. Such inversion, Partridge shows, is Jonson's main satiric device.

ROGER L. CLUBB

University of British Columbia

MALLARMÉ IN ITALY: LITERARY INFLUENCE AND CRITICAL RESPONSE. By Olga Ragusa. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1957. vi, 228 p.

Miss Ragusa devotes a useful first chapter to "A Survey of Mallarmé's Literary Fortune in France," beginning with the publication of poems by Mallarmé in the *Parnasse Contemporain* of 1866 and of 1871, the rejection of the *Apres-midi d'un faune* by the third *Parnasse Contemporain* in 1875, and its publication as the "minuscule plaquette" described so appreciatively by Huysmans in *A rebours* (1884). Verlaine's study on Mallarmé in his *Poètes maudits* (1883) and Barrès' article in *Les Taches d'encre* (1884-85) place his aesthetics in the history of French literature. By 1886 Mallarmé, now established in Paris and presiding over his "*après-midi littéraires*," was a glorious *chef-d'école* and exerted a vast personal influence on contemporary poets. This intellectual leadership remained undisputed until the poet's death in 1898. The first decade of this century saw—as so frequently happens—a sharp decline in the poet's reputation. In 1911 Albert Thibaudet's important volume, *La Poésie de Stéphane Mallarmé*, opened a new period in the understanding of the poet and laid the foundations for all subsequent research. Miss Ragusa's sketch is sustained by copious footnotes listing all the important French publications on Mallarmé from the first studies on him (not clearly dated) through the 1930s.

The second chapter deals with Mallarmé's introduction to Italy and his early reputation there. The author stresses the important role played by Vittorio Pica, an active and intelligent literary and art critic who was familiar with French literature and had been a guest of Mallarmé's *mardis*. In 1886 he published in the *Gazzetta letteraria* a long article on Mallarmé's poems and ideas, with copious quotations; it was republished twice in Italy before the end of the century, with additions to bring it up to date, and aroused interest among Italian critics—A. Baccelli, C. Villani, F. De Roberto, L. D'Ambra, L. Capuana, and others. In the 1890s Italian opinion on Mallarmé was divided. Pica and his followers sought to present the poet and his work sympathetically, while the opponents of decadentism, like E. Panzacchi and A. Richard, cited him as a horrible example. There was an exchange of articles in the *Gazzetta letteraria* and in other journals; these, along with D. De Roberto's *Poeti francesi contemporanei* (1900), served to introduce the poet, and French critical opinion upon him, to the Italian public.

The next chapter, "Assimilation: Mallarmé, Futurism, and *La Voce* (1900-1920)," brings us to the fruitful "moment of assimilation" (Binni), of "intimate collaboration between internal, Italian, transformations and foreign importations." It was during this period, and particularly after the appearance of Thibaudet's study in France, that the movement of ideas in Italy, after the ferment of *crepuscolarismo* and futurism, became extremely hospitable to foreign, and mainly French, literary experimentation and *avant-garde* tendencies. Miss Ragusa devotes some interesting pages to the roles of Marinetti and Soffici, and of the journal, *La Voce*, in bringing French poets to the attention of Italians, and to the subsequent attitudes of Italian critics, Crocean and non-Crocean, towards Mallarmé, Valéry, and their Italian disciples. The historical picture is complex, and it has not yet been completely worked out; Miss Ragusa approaches it from several directions and manages to throw some light on the fortunes of Mallarmé in the many-sided polemic between traditional and the various "new" shades of criticism.

The final chapter is entitled "Elaboration: Mallarmé and Italian Hermeticism (1920-1940)." It begins with a brief and useful survey of Italian critical thinking

on *ermetismo*—and this is not a simple skein to unravel—and on the degree to which the *ermetici* themselves used Mallarmé's aesthetics in their own doctrine. The final pages deal with Mallarmé's impact upon Ungaretti.

All in all, this is an excellent study and, indeed, a pioneering venture in its field. It contains a wealth of specific information and of well-considered judgments, and will serve for a long time as a basis for further investigations in this rich domain.

A useful appendix lists Italian translations from Mallarmé and an abundant bibliography, both French and Italian, of Mallarmé studies.

C. B. B.

VARIA

A Note on Beckett, Dante, and Geulincx

Readers of Mr. Strauss' Beckett-Dante article in the Summer 1959 issue of *Comparative Literature* might be interested in fuller information on Beckett's debts, since Beckett's *œuvre* is a happy hunting ground for comparatists.

Belacqua, named after Dante's slothful Florentine, is the protagonist not only of "Dante and the Lobster" but of ten other Beckett stories, nine of which were assembled in 1934 as *More Pricks Than Kicks* (*pace* Acts IX, rather than the *Purgatorio*). The uncollected Belacqua adventure, "Sedendo and Quiescendo," was published in *transition* in 1932. In "Draff" the last of the *Prick* stories, Belacqua is reduced to a corpse, whose undertaker is called Malacoda, even as the trumpet-rumped, lying devil of Cantos XXI and XXIII of the *Inferno*. Along with Scarmiglione, Malacoda reappears in Beckett's 1935 volume of poems, *Echo's Bones*, where the atmosphere is more infernal than purgatorial. Twice Dante is mentioned specifically: "Dante and blissful Beatrice are there / prior to Vita Nuova..."; "Io Alighieri has got off au revoir to all that" ("Sanies," II). It is possible, too, that the thirteen poems of *Echo's Bones* (a favorite Beckett number thereafter) depends upon the year of Dante's vision—1300.

In works published after Beckett's transplantation to Paris, Mr. Strauss traces Belacqua through *Murphy*, an English novel, and *Molloy*, the first of the French novels, where he is confused with Sordello: "... Belacqua ou de Sordello, je ne me rappelle plus." It is unlikely, however, that Beckett shares Molloy's failing memory; Molloy compares his position under the shadow of the grey rock to that of Dante's Purgatorial figures, and of course the comparison is valid for either of them. In *Malone meurt*, the second volume of Beckett's French trilogy, Belacqua disappears, but Malone, like Belacqua of "Dante and the Lobster," and Dante himself, sees Cain in the moon. Moreover, Malone, like Molloy, evokes Sordello with his "air d'un lion au repos." Although Dante's Sordello guides Virgil and Dante in Purgatory—more trustworthily than Malacoda performed the same function in Hell—Sordello has confessed: "Non per far, ma per non far ho perduto / di veder l'alto Sol..." Probably Mr. Strauss would accept Sordello as another avatar of the vegetating hero he interprets Beckett to have created.

However, to see in Beckett the poet of vegetation, one must accept too literally his persona's words of boredom and resignation. If his fictions did little but twiddle their thumbs till kingdom come (or not come), there would be no Beckett *œuvre*, full of illogical progressions and excruciating tensions. Both progressions (or retrogressions) and tensions are rooted not so much in a Dantesque Purgatory as in the Cartesian cleavage of body from mind. A 1930 poem, *Whoroscope*, is a dramatic monologue spoken by Descartes; and Beckett makes several subsequent references to Arnold Geulincx, the Cartesian occasionalist. Geulincx' most celebrated pronouncement, "Ubi nihil vales, ibi nihil velis" (which Malone dimly echoes as "ne rien pouvant, ne rien voulant"), is not without linkage to the Beckett-Belacqua-Sordello inactivity. *Murphy* is the most Geulincxian of the

works, as Mr. Mintz has shown (*Perspective*, Autumn 1959), but the occasionalist is also mentioned lovingly in both *La Fin* and *Molloy*. Beckett's favorite image from Geulincx is that of the galley slave who lays down his oar to crawl eastward under the whip, while the boat is sailing westward. As late as the *Unnamable*, Beckett evokes this image as the sum of human liberty, but, finally, the nameless narrator admits, "... je ne rampe plus entre les bancs, sous la lune à l'ombre des triques."

Neither crawling nor even stirring—for the body, paralyzed and rotting, has long been useless as a pathway of knowledge—the Unnamable carries on the furious battle begun by his predecessors. Through the successive steps of English and French fiction, the Beckett hero has set his mind—"ne soyons pas pédant"—in quest of him*self*. Vindictively reacting against the fiction of all knowledge, violently rejecting language which is all foreign to him, Beckett's "dying gladiator" is not twiddling his thumbs into vegetation, but fighting with a fierceness unparalleled in metaphysical art. As amateurs of the savage sport, it is *our* thumbs that should be turned up.

RUBY COHN

Stanford, Calif.

Locus Amoenus

In dealing with the "locus amoenus" or "pleasance" topos (*European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, New York, 1953, pp. 195 ff.) E. R. Curtius states that the earliest example which he can find of this kind of ecphrasis in Latin poetry is Petronius, Carm. 131:

"Mobilis aestivas platanus diffuderat umbras
Et bacis redimita[1] Daphne tremulaeque cupressus
Et circum tonsae trepidanti vertice pinus.
Has inter ludebat quis errantibus amnis
Spumeus, et querulo vexabat rore lapillos.
Dignus amore locus: testis silvestris aedon
Atque urbana Procne, quae circum gramina fusae
Et molles violas cantu sua rura colebant."

An even earlier one, however, which exhibits most of the characteristics mentioned by Curtius is Propertius, IV, ix, 23-30 (from an aetiological poem recounting the slaying of Cacus by Hercules and the foundation of the "Ara maxima"):

"Sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas,
lucus ubi umbroso fecerat orbe nemus,
Femineae loca clausa deae fontesque piandos,
impune et nullis sacra retecta viris.

[1] The "redemita" in the text is a misprint.

Devia puniceae velabant limina vittae,
putris odorato luxerat igne casa,
Populus et longis[2] ornabat frondibus aedem,
multaque cantantes umbra tegebat aves."

H. MacL. Currie

Queen Mary College, University of London

Announcements

Allo scopo di affiancare l'attività scientifica della rivista *Studi Francesi*, l'Istituto di Lingua e Letteratura francese della Facoltà di Lettere dell'Università di Torino prende l'iniziativa di pubblicare una Biblioteca di Studi Francesi che riunirà in un'unica impresa editoriale quanto di più importante si viene preparando in Italia nel campo della Letteratura Francese.

I due primi volumi della Biblioteca saranno i seguenti: F. Simone, *Il Rinascimento francese: studi e ricerche* (di imminente pubblicazione); *Studi in onore di Carlo Pellegrini* (in preparazione).

CL is pleased to congratulate Dr. Helmut Hatzfeld, a member of the Editorial Board, who was made Doctor honoris causa by the University of Grenoble on November 7, 1960, and elected corresponding member of the Bavarian Academy (Munich) on the occasion of its bicentenary jubilee, November 20, 1960.

Dr. Karl-Ludwig Selig has succeeded Dr. Werner P. Friederich as editor of the University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature (monograph series and *Yearbook*). Dr. Friederich will, however, remain in touch with the undertaking which he so successfully initiated a decade ago.

Dr. Ulrich Leo reaches his seventieth birthday on May 25, 1960. *CL* is happy to join his many friends in offering congratulations and best wishes to the eminent critic who has made so many distinguished contributions as a Hispanist, Italianist, and comparatist.

The American Comparative Literature Association was organized on January 1, 1960 as the western-hemisphere branch of the International Comparative Literature Association. The officers of the new association are Werner P. Friederich, president; René Wellek, vice-president; Haskell M. Block, secretary; and Eugène Joliat, treasurer. It is planned that the first meeting will be held in September 1962 and that the association will meet triennially thereafter. Dues are $1.50 a year, and include membership in the International Comparative Liter-

[2] largis (Baehrens); glaucis (Housman, commended by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, 1956, p. 259).

ature Association. Professor Haskell M. Block, University of Wisconsin, will send further information, along with an invitation to membership, to anyone interested in the association.

Books Received

Avalle-Arce, Juan Bautista. La novela pastoril española. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959. x, 248 p.

Cioranesco, Alexandre. Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle. Collaboration et préface de V. L. Saulnier. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1959. xvi, 746 p.

Gicovate, Bernardo. La poesía de Juan Ramón Jiménez: Ensayo de exégesis. San Juan de Puerto Rico: Ediciones Asomante en colaboración con la Universidad de Tulane, 1959. 125 p.

Mukerjea, S. V. Disjecta Membra: Studies in Literature and Life. Bangalore: Indian Institute of World Culture, 1959. viii, 334 p.

Neiman, Fraser (editor). Essays, Letters, and Reviews by Matthew Arnold. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960. xvi, 398 p.

Novalis. Hymns to the Night and Other Selected Writings. Translated, with an introduction, by Charles E. Passage. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1960. xx, 72 p.

Stäel, Mme de. De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales. Édition critique par Paul Van Tieghem. Vols. I and II. Geneva: Librairie Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1959. lxiv, 442 p.

Stevenson, R. H. (translator). Amiran-Darejaniani: A Cycle of Medieval Georgian Tales traditionally ascribed to Mose Khoneli. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. xxxiv, 240 p.

Stump, Reva. Movement and Vision in George Eliot's Novels. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1959. xi, 332.

Tissier, André. M. de Crac gentilhomme gascon. Paris. Didier, 1959. 233 p.

Wilde, Oscar. The Importance of Being Earnest. Edited by Vincent F. Hopper and Gerald B. Lahey. Great Neck, N. Y.: Baron's Educational Series, 1959. 148 p.

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. The Invention of the Sonnet and Other Studies in Italian Literature. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1959. 354 p.

Witte, William. Schiller and Burns and Other Essays. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959. ix, 118 p.

Yatron, Michael. America's Literary Revolt. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 176 p.